

C. P. 1
1825



Class BX8332

Book R6

PRESENTED BY



THE

LIBRARY OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF

CHICAGO

A

LETTER

ON

J. S. Murray

CHURCH METHODISM,

ADDRESSED TO

JOHN CURRY, ESQ.

DUBLIN.

BY MARK ROBINSON.

"It is not beyond the bounds of reasonable hope, that Methodism, conforming itself to the original intentions of its founder, may again draw towards the Establishment from which it has seceded, and deserve to be recognized as an auxiliary Institution. The obstacles to this are surely not insuperable. And were this effected, John Wesley would then be ranked not only among the most remarkable and influential men of his age, but among the greatest benefactors of his country and his kind."—SOUTHEY.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR SEELEY AND SON, FLEET-STREET; LONGMAN, HURST,
REES, ORME, BROWNE, AND GREEN; HATCHARD AND SON;
SOLD BY I. WILSON, HULL; AND ALL BOOKSELLERS.

—
1827.

BX 8332
TR6

Mrs. J. H. M. Curry

Vol. 5. 243

PREFACE.

THE author of the following Letter is quite aware that some readers, who are unacquainted with all the circumstances of the case, may suppose that the proper time for its publication has been suffered to pass by, and that it is now too late to introduce it to the public. He is free to acknowledge, that had he followed his own judgment, he should have published it at the time it was written, as he was afraid that the parties he had to contend with, would endeavour to make their own impression by an *exparté* statement, which he now finds to be the case. The trustees, so frequently named in the following Letter, know that the author repeatedly urged the propriety of keeping nothing of importance, connected with the controversy, secret; and that he repeatedly offered to meet Mr. M'Afee in public, that the merits of the questions at issue between the Primitive Wesleyan Methodist preachers from Ireland, and the Church Methodists in England, might be fairly discussed. This, however, Mr. M'Afee refused; and some of the trustees were very desirous that as little publicity as possible should be given to the differences unhappily existing between them and the Irish preachers, as detailed in the following pages. In these sentiments the writer confesses he could not coincide, though he did not then think himself called on to publish any thing contrary to their wishes; but he has not seen reason to alter the opinions he expressed at large on this subject, in his introduction to 2nd edition of his 'Observations on the System of Wesleyan Methodism'; believing that it is always best to proceed in a direct open way, without fearing the consequences which may arise from any evils *purely accidental*, and which, he conceives, can never warrant any one in choosing an eccentric course.

To those readers who are totally unacquainted with the rise of Church Methodism, it may be necessary to state, that most of those who are now Church Methodists, were a few years ago, members of the Dissenting or Conference Methodist Connexion, which they left in consequence of two things.

1. That the Methodist travelling preachers meet together once a year, in what they term Conference, and there make whatever laws they please for the government of the Methodist Connexion, and that without the consent or control of the members of the Society, thereby establishing an aristocratical form of government, so much at variance with the excellent and long-tried principles of the English Government in Church and State; and by this means reserving to themselves a power, which no body of preachers or ministers in Christendom possess.*

* Even the best friends of Methodism have allowed this, when they felt themselves at liberty to express their undisguised sentiments. Of this we have a direct and striking instance in the case of Mr. Richard Watson, the present President of the Methodist Conference, who, when he had left the Dissenting Conference Connexion, and joined the New Connexion, (the Society of which the late Mr. Alexander Kilham was the founder,) observes, when writing the Memoir of a Mr. Cash, in the New Methodist Magazine for 1805—"He discovered a radical defect in the old system (*Methodism*); a power ASSUMED, NOT DELGATED—and exercised without limit and without accountableness. A power which, in the hands of infallible virtue, would have produced the most beneficial effects; but in the hands of fallible

2. The Church Methodists left the Conference Connexion, because the latter had departed so entirely from the simple pure anti-sectarian spirit of the first Methodists, in having separated from the Church of England, and sought to establish a kind of rival Church, contrary to their solemn promise, as a body of people, to the country at large, and in direct opposition to the principles professed by those preachers and their friends, who collected immense sums of money, with which to build chapels. Besides, the Church Methodists considered the attempt, which the preachers had several times made, to introduce a kind of episcopal ordination into Conference, by which certain leading preachers were to be called bishops,—the introduction of baptism and the Lord's supper into their chapels, and burial of the dead, sufficiently indicative of the deviation which Methodism has made from its original course.

It is unnecessary, however, at present to enter further into an account of the constitution of the Dissenting Conference Connexion, as it has been pretty fully discussed already, as may be seen by reference to the Appendix, No. I. (See note, page 42.)

When the Church Methodists separated from the Conference Connexion, they applied for assistance to the Primitive Wesleyan Methodists of Ireland, and with what success the following pages will shew. This brings the reader to the Letter itself, which the author addressed to a highly respectable and valued correspondent in Dublin, JOHN CURRY, Esq. *Rogerson's Quay*. As the Letter was drawn up at the request of the trustees of the Church Methodist Chapel in this town, they all carefully examined it before they signed it. Should any of the trustees who have become discouraged as to the success of Church Methodism, in consequence of the difficulties which have presented themselves, feel tempted for a moment to listen to those advocates of Irish Methodism, who are stating that the agreement entered into by the writer and Mr. Atkinson, at the Dublin Conference, was different to what it is represented to be in the following Letter, let them remember that they were present when Mr. M'Afee and Mr. M'Conkey, the Irish preachers, were met face to face, and several hours spent in

"men, is often made the instrument of degradation on the one part, and the support of illegal and unchristian authority on the other."—The late excellent Mr. Joseph Benson, who was many times President of the Conference, and a personal friend of Mr. Wesley's, in writing to a friend respecting the settlement of the Methodist chapels, says—*"I find our Lord and his Apostles and Evangelists, preaching every where, wherever a door was open, without making any objections on account of the place they might preach in not being settled as they recommended. This power, and together with it all our influence in spiritual matters, we are depriving ourselves of as fast as we can; by these violent measures we are prejudicing our people against us, we are filling their minds with jealousies and suspicions concerning us, that we are selfish designing men, aiming not so much to do our hearers spiritual good, as to establish ourselves in temporal power and authority; thus the way being blocked up to do them good, our usefulness is obstructed among them, their love is lessened towards us, and our authority over them is at an end. But as a recompence for this loss, human laws have given us power over the bricks and timber of an house, and we can, let who will hinder, send preachers to preach, where by and bye it may be, none will be present to hear; poor recompence!"*—The late Doctor Coke, when writing to a friend of his in Ireland, says—*"Hitherto we have seen, since the death of Mr. Wesley, the most perfect aristocracy existing, perhaps upon earth. The people have no power, we THE WHOLE, in the fullest sense which can be conceived."*—Another leading preacher, who lived and died in the Connexion, Mr. John Pawson, remarks—*"Remember, O ye Methodists! that the reign of popery*

the discussion of the subject, that they heard all these two preachers (who were also present at the Irish Conference,) could state; they heard Mr. Atkinson's and the writer's reply, *and that they then and there expressed their unanimous approval* of what the writer and Mr. Atkinson had done, and refused Mr. M'Afee's proposal, as the following Letter to Mr. Curry, signed by *all* the trustees, shews.

The author of the following Letter has been induced to publish it, more especially because he learns that the Irish preachers and their friends are indefatigable in endeavouring to make an impression on those to whom they have access, which is injurious to the character of himself and Mr. Atkinson, who, they say, have acted unfairly toward the Irish Conference; and as he knows that there is no foundation whatever for such statements, he feels himself compelled to furnish that part of the public who may feel interested in the matter, with a fair and true statement of the whole business.

The writer is encouraged also to publish this Letter, because it has obtained the approval of some of the very ablest judges. To shew how it has been received by two or three of those, he subjoins two excellent notes he received from them at the time they read the MS.; and a letter from a third, containing some original and very able remarks on the principal question at issue. (See Appendix, No. XIII.)

The reader will perceive that it was the very ardent wish of the author and his friends, to avoid any open breach with the Irish Connexion; and that they pressed it upon the Irish Conference, to maintain a friendly relation to them: fearing if that should not be the case, that both Connexions might eventually suffer. However, in spite of all remonstrance, the Irish Connexion gave permission to Mr. M'Conkey to remain in Beverley to oppose them; and afterwards they sent another preacher (Mr. Ford) to his assistance. In consequence of the opposition made by them, and the proceedings of another Irish preacher, (Mr. West) the very evil has happened, respecting which the author expressed his fears at the conclusion of the following Letter.—First one member of Society, and then another, becoming discouraged by the unexpected opposition thus given to Church Methodism, and by learning that the trustees had to contend with considerable debt on their chapels, stepped aside till the Society became greatly reduced in number, and the Congregation itself, from this and similar causes, has also greatly decreased.

"is past and gone, let it never be restored to you under any shape or name. In the name of Him who bought you with His blood, maintain the rights and liberties of your own consciences."—And Mr. Bramwell, a preacher held equally high in the estimation of the Connexion, says—*"As ministers of Christ, we are too much upon the money system; and from that, by some determined act, we ought to effect an immediate deliverance."*—The leaders and stewards in many Societies have deeply felt the oppressive power of the Conference. Take the following as a specimen—*"Want of deliberation with the people, is the great source of all those evils that exist among us; it has already greatly shaken the confidence of many."* Address from a large and respectable meeting at Newcastle, Wm. Smith, Esq. in the chair, 18th Feb. 1796.—Indeed the fact is so notorious, that it has not escaped the observation of both Churchmen and Dissenters. The Christian Observer for 1819 remarks—*"The inherent and universal popery of the human mind, perpetually gravitating, under any religious establishment, toward spiritual despotism, will develop itself in Edinburgh as well as in Rome and elsewhere; and in proportion as general assemblies, conclaves, convocations,—YES, AND METHODIST CONFERENCES, shrink from publicity in their proceedings, will they severally*

Those, however, who remain united together, are not willing that a religious cause, which both on abstract principles and practical utility, seems to promise so much good to the country, if once firmly established, should be hastily abandoned. They bear in mind, too, that it has now become pretty well known through the country, and has already obtained a degree of approval, which very few religious attempts ever did in their commencement. (See Appendix, No I. page 50.) The check which those unfriendly measures have given to it, directly and indirectly, though considerable as it relates to Beverley, yet can be of little consequence to any other part of the country where it may become established, as the same difficulties cannot occur again. If ever it was true, that Church Methodism can render important service to the Established Church, it is true still; and it is hoped, that when an appeal is once fully and fairly made to the benevolence of the British public, sufficient means will be found for giving it a fair trial.

It will be perceived by the attentive reader, that though the principal cause of difference between the writer and his friends, and the Irish Methodists, related to *discipline*; yet in one particular, that indirectly concerned the *doctrines* the respective parties professed, as may be seen at page 6. The Church Methodists are as far from adopting a latitudinarian course "carried about with every wind of doctrine" as they are from the opposite error of "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."—They desire that Church Methodism may, in its nature, be truly Catholic—that while they remain faithful to sound doctrines, and maintain a humble adherence to them, they may yet be charitable and comprehensive in construing them.

The writer has been under the necessity of repeating much that had been before published, in order to give a faithful account of all that related to the subject; but this has been unavoidable. He has also to apologize for the want of a more correct style of writing, since he has been subject to continual interruptions in proceeding; and he should not be surprised, as it has been written at different intervals, if some facts be stated twice.

The reader will please to bear in mind, that the writer alone is accountable for whatever is introduced in the form of Notes and Appendix; as the Letter was independent of both, when the trustees signed it.

"*approach the secret chambers of the INQUISITION ITSELF.*"—The principle is ably observed upon by Dr. Southey—"The person (says he) whose moral nature is not injured by the possession of absolute power, must even be more elevated above his fellow-creatures in wisdom and virtue than in authority."—"Were Mr. Westey (says the Christian Guardian) to return to the world, he would not know his own children, so far have they departed from the Methodism of his day. Much of this change has been produced by the unchecked domination of the preachers, which might perhaps have been prevented, had some of the lay members been of the Conference; and the Methodists might, at this day, have been in close alliance with that Church, from the bosom of which their greatest glory, Mr. Westey springs."—An eminent Dissenting minister some time ago observed to a friend of the writer's, that "The Dissenting ministers were astonished that the Methodists would submit to such an arbitrary mode of government, as that formed by the Conference."—And another, who is one of the most eminent Dissenting ministers now living, speaking of the preachers refusing to admit Representatives into the Conference, says—"THEY MAY RESIST THE CLAIMS OF JUSTICE, AND THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE FOR A TIME, BUT THEY MUST YIELD AT LAST,"

CONTENTS.



Letter to John Curry, Esq.	1
---------------------------------	---

APPENDIX.

<i>Article.</i>	<i>Page.</i>
I. Mr. M'Afee's and Mr. M'Conkey's proceedings.....	33
II. Remarks on Mr. H. Sandwith's Pamphlet.....	51
III. ——— on Mr. Welch's Pamphlet	60
IV. ——— on Mr. Galland's Pamphlet	64
V. ——— on the Methodist Magazine	71
VI. Mr. Watson's Remarks on Band-Meetings, noticed.....	86
VII. Mr. Watson's Remarks on Southey's Observations respecting Mr. Wesley's Sermon on the Vineyard, considered	92 92
VIII. Mr. West's conduct relative to the Osborne-street Chapel, Hull.....	96
IX. The Trustees' notice to Mr. West.....	103
X. Correspondence between Mr. W. H. Dikes, of Hull, and Mr. Robert Smelt, of Beverley	104
XI. Letter from William Curry, Jun. Esq. of Dublin.....	109
— Letters from several eminent Persons on the Author's Letter to John Curry, Esq. the first Article in this Book.....	<i>ib.</i>
XII. Extract from the Memoirs of the late Mr. John Robinson.....	112
XIII. Messrs. Graham and Hirst's Letter, respecting Mr. Welch, of Hull....	113
Index.....	114

A LETTER.



Beverley, 9th January, 1826.

MY DEAR SIR,

I felt much concerned a short time ago, to learn that a letter which I wrote to you some time after my return from Ireland had never been sent. I gave it in charge to Mr. M'Afee, who expected that he could send it free of postage, but was by some means or other prevented.—Considering that I have only written one short letter to Dublin since I returned, which was to your brother on my landing, I am afraid lest you and your family should suppose that I have soon forgotten the great kindness shewn me while under your father's hospitable roof. I assure you I shall never forget, nor cease to admire, the many excellencies I witnessed amongst our Irish friends, especially in your and your father's families: and I sincerely trust that no difference of opinion on minor subjects connected with religion, will in the least degree lessen the real respect and kindness which we entertained for one another on my return to England.

Your communication to Mr. M'Afee, has in substance been read to myself and friends; and in consequence, on a subsequent Wednesday evening, a meeting was held for the purpose of deliberating on the most prudent steps to be taken in the present state of our Societies; and I was desired by the meeting to address you, as the Secretary of the Corresponding Committee, on the subject. This I will endeavour to do as circumstantially as possible; and if, in the course of my detail, I should fall into any error of statement, or be betrayed into any unjustifiable expression, I beg to bespeak your indulgence, as my numerous engagements necessarily occupy a large portion of my attention, and leave me an inadequate share of time for the discussion of so important a matter.

A reference to my correspondence with our valued friend Mr. Averill, and yourself, will shew—that, understanding there was a considerable body of Methodists in Ireland, who had separated from the Conference on similar grounds to those on which we might do the same, we were desirous of ascertaining whether you would feel disposed to give us your assistance, in re-establishing Methodism on the original simple plan of union with the Church of England. The prompt attention shewn to our wish by Mr. Averill and yourself, ended (after every method was tried in vain to obtain a fair discussion of those subjects in the official meetings of the Conference Connexion) in your sending over to our assistance Mr. Mallin and Mr. M'Afee.

Being desirous of preventing any future misunderstanding, Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Shepherd, and I, inquired of the preachers, before they commenced their labours amongst us, whether they fully understood

the ground on which they had come over to assist us, as we supposed they were aware that we did not agree with our Irish friends in *every* particular, though we did in what appeared to be the principal regulations in their Connexion. They replied, that they were perfectly aware of that, as it had been made a matter of discussion by the Corresponding Committee; and though some of the friends objected to their extending us their help, unless we agreed with them in *all* things, the majority determined, that if we were found to agree with them in *three* things, they would give us their assistance. That we should hold no meetings in canonical hours, when their is service in the Church—that we should not administer the Sacraments—and that we should have a representative system: they added, that the Committee was of opinion, that other regulations ought to be left to ourselves. We expressed our pleasure at the kind and liberal determination of the Committee, and indulged a hope that our union with our Irish friends would be firm and lasting.

After some conversation and correspondence with several eminent clergymen and others, on the subject of such a constitution as would, under all circumstances, be the most eligible for the purposes contemplated, I proceeded to draw out a small tract, taken chiefly from your own little tract, entitled "*Principles*." Mr. M'Afee called while I was thus engaged, and I shewed him what I had done; but he objected to my publishing it, and especially to my having, by any alteration in the constitution, left the way into the Society open to those preachers and people who, while they believe the great Articles of the Christian Faith, yet leave those peculiarities of Methodism in which, even amongst the Methodists themselves, as well as pious Christians in general, there is diversity of opinion; and in which, as there seems no warrant for them in the Scriptures, it appears to be "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," to insist on uniformity.—In a letter I wrote to you a short time after this, you will find the outlines of this constitution, upon which I do not remember your making any remarks, and certainly I do not recollect that you returned me any written answer. Things continued thus till your last Conference; what passed there I will now notice, by giving you a report of what passed at our meeting on Wednesday.

The meeting was called by Mr. M'Afee, who brought with him a list of questions, which he begged me to answer *instantly*. I remarked, that he scarcely placed me upon equal ground, to expect me to make an immediate reply to a number of questions, which I had had no opportunity of considering, and especially, as the meeting was perfectly aware that my time had been completely occupied; that I had but just returned from soliciting subscriptions for a chapel in Hull, and not had the least intimation of any one coming with questions already prepared in this manner; but as I had nothing but truth in view, I would undertake to answer any question he might ask me. He then proceeded to ask—"Why did you not fully explain to the Conference your ideas of a constitution?" I answered—"1. Because I had not at that time completed what I had begun, and was therefore not prepared to discuss it.

"2. If I had had it even ever so perfect, I should not have introduced it into the Irish Conference, because it was clearly understood

when the preachers came over from Ireland, that we were bound to no further uniformity, than in the *three* particulars already named; and as the Conference had no right to interfere, beyond what had already been agreed to, it would have been improper to introduce another subject for deliberation, over which they had no control.

"3. Because both Mr. M'Afee and Mr. John Curry knew from what had already been developed of our plan, that we differed from the Irish friends so far as the substitution of the word *essential* creates a difference: that they knew the outlines of the plan, and could therefore have introduced it themselves, if they had thought proper.

"4. Because I thought there was an impropriety in discussing the merits and demerits of a constitution, which would indirectly have brought the Irish constitution under review, and thereby perhaps have unsettled the minds of some in the Conference. On that account, some of the friends (Mr. J. Curry, I think, for one) agreed with me in opinion, that even as it regards *one* of the *three* parts in which we concurred with the Conference, it would be better not to make it a matter of debate; viz. the way in which a representative system should be managed; whether it should consist of one house, composed of preachers and representatives; or of two houses, the one preachers, the other representatives. As, however, Mr. M'Gregor and other friends wished that that difference should be introduced, it was. The consequence was, that some of the friends evidently became doubtful whether the Irish plan was equal to ours, as it was evident they had clearly left the power in the hands of the preachers. Mr. Kingston, I think, contented himself with the persuasion, that the Irish plan would admit of two houses as well as the English one; and Mrs. J. Curry and the Rev. Mr. Kearney, before whom the matter was in consequence afterwards introduced, (and no one who knows them will doubt of their competency to give a sound opinion) were quite in favour of our plan. Mr. Walker, of Athlone, seemed impressed with the same conviction, but observed it was too late to remedy it; remarking, however, on parting, that still he was satisfied with the Irish constitution. It formed no part of the object of our visit to Ireland to complete our constitution, *which it was understood from the first was to be done by ourselves in England, having agreed with our Irish friends on the essential parts of it*; nor did we at all wish to interfere with the constitution of Primitive Wesleyan Methodism in Ireland.

"5. The Conference referred the subject to the Corresponding Committee, expressing it as their opinion that the Committee had exceeded its authority, in directing the preachers to require no further conformity than in the *three* articles already named. In the Committee the matter was discussed at considerable length, and Mr. Atkinson and I refused any further conformity than that which related to *essential* or *fundamental* matters; and though Mr. M'Afee and Mr. M'Gregor opposed us at some length, and Mr. M'Afee drew up an article which we refused to sign, (remaining firm) and Mr. Averill having declared that he saw no probability of our coming to any agreement, I got up to leave the meeting; assuring the friends, that I should for my own part, return to England with the same trust in Divine Providence as that with which I had come to Ireland. Mr. John Curry, however, drew up two

resolutions, which granted all we wished, which we instantly agreed to, and which went to state that we agreed with them in *fundamental* matters, and the preachers should be sent to assist us, *they remaining* subject to the economy and control of the Conference."* At this meeting Mr. M'Afee observed, that he objected to the constitution I had shewn him, and objected to my publishing it.

Such was the substance of my answer to Mr. M'Afee, at one of the first meetings held in Beverley on the subject, to which he made no reply whatever; but proceeded to put his next question, which was:—"When Mr. Averill asked you, in Conference, if there was any thing but the constitution in which you differed from us, why did you not say there was?"

I replied, Mr. Averill said, "We fear, brother Robinson, that you want to place Church Methodism under the power of the clergy, and destroy our economy by doing away with our love-feasts, class meetings, band meetings, &c." I observed to Mr. M'Afee and our trustees in the meeting, that in answer to this, in the Irish Conference, I replied to Mr. Averill that we had no such intention; that in all *essential* matters we considered ourselves Primitive Methodists. I said, that one gentleman in the Conference, whose name I did not know, but who wore a long blue coat and was of a ruddy complexion, said "the best way is for our English friends to sign our '*Principles*.' I replied, that was not likely, as we did not believe them!

* At the time of this conversation in Beverley, neither Mr. M'Afee nor I had a copy of the agreement; but some time afterwards he obtained one from Dublin, and though he had it not at hand at the time I received the following account from him, yet he said he was certain that he quoted the agreement correctly, and therefore I wrote down the following as an exact copy of it:—"1. The Conference is rejoiced to learn "that a number of persons in Beverley, &c. and in other parts of England, have adopted "our fundamental principles, and united together to bring Methodism back to its simple "original union with the Established Church. 2. That we do act in union with them "by sending them preachers to assist them; *these preachers* to be at the disposal of the "Irish Conference, and subject to our economy."

Upon this agreement it may be remarked, that Mr. M'Afee had read it many times over before he gave it as above, and that therefore it is probably correct; at least one would not suspect that the agreement given here will be more favourable to our side than the original; but let any one impartially consider what took place as detailed above, and then say in what sense he understands the words "*fundamental*," and "*in union with*." I had expressly told the whole Conference that it was not likely we should sign their book of '*Principles*,' as we did not believe them. When I came into the committee-room two slips of paper were handed over to me to sign, both of which I and Mr. Atkinson refused. These papers I unconsciously folded up and put in my pocket, and never discovered them till a little time before Mr. M'Afee left Beverley. On shewing them to Mr. M'Afee, he recognised the writing, though in pencil, and much obliterated. One proposed, "that the Church Methodists in England should remain subject to the Irish Conference, till they formed a Conference in England." *The other*, "that the Methodists in England should be guided by the Irish book of '*Principles*' till they formed a Conference in England." Both these were rejected, and therefore it was not likely that we should immediately sign two propositions handed over to us by Mr. John Curry, if we understood them as containing the same sense, which indeed an inspection of them will shew; and as a proof that I uniformly kept to the same thing, and did not give way (which, had these propositions been the same as these we rejected, would have been the case,) Mr. William Curry, sen. who was in the meeting, said to me after the meeting, "You are a strange man for perseverance—you got your own way at last."

It has been said by one person in Beverley, that as by the agreement at the Conference the preachers were to be subject to the Irish economy, it follows that the peo-

I observed to Mr. M'Afee and our friends, that the same reasons which prevented my introducing the subject into Conference, prevented my entering into Mr. Averill's inquiries, farther than was necessary. Indeed it could scarcely be expected, considering the weakness and prejudice of human nature, that full justice would have been done, or strict impartiality exercised, on a question which, as it related to themselves in their own constitution, they had set at rest. I said I would again declare what I had said in the Conference, and if required sign the two resolutions hereafter named, a hundred times told; as I remained of the same opinion still, and never had entertained such a thought as that of placing Church Methodism under Episcopal Jurisdiction, nor of destroying the economy of Methodism; but then I should be sorry to see the preachers and people bound up to every *peculiarity* and *non-essential* doctrine of Methodism. But I said, that though we conceived the Conference had no right to interfere with our constitution, farther than we had at first agreed, yet I made no secret of our views to several of the friends in private conversation, and among the rest to Mr. Averill. That when I had the pleasure of accompanying him to the house of our kind friend in the country (at Roebuck) Mr. Keene's, I said to him after dinner—"Mr. Averill, I wish to act with the greatest openness in what I do, and therefore I concluded on asking your opinion as to the management of our classes. We have some respectable people who are our hearers, and who, I believe, are piously disposed, but who would not meet with us in class on the old plan of conducting them; we therefore think of meeting some of the classes by reading the Scriptures in them, and inviting all who are present to ask any questions or make any remarks they please, either as to the meaning of what is read, or as to their own religious experience; but not subjecting them to examination." Mr. Averill replied, that *he thought "that would be very well."* I turned to young Mr. Keene, who stood

ple must. This is, however, at once refuted by reference to the fact that Mr. Atkinson and I refused to sign the memorandums handed to us a few minutes before in the committee-room, which expressly stated that the *Societies* were to remain subject to the Irish economy, till a Conference was formed in England. But when another proposition was made, which went merely to the length of allowing the Irish Conference the direction of *their own preachers*, and subjecting them to their economy, we agreed; and I remarked at the time, that I thought it perfectly reasonable that *the preachers* should remain subject to the Conference; but that we agreed that the *Societies* should, we flatly deny, and the whole history of our proceedings is proof of it. And let it not be forgotten, that Mr. M'Afee acknowledged in the hearing of Mr. Baker, when speaking to Mr. M'Conkey, that he considered they (himself and Mr. M'Conkey) were quite differently circumstanced here to what they were in Ireland; that they were sent over simply to preach and assist us, but had nothing to do with any circular we might publish. This, is beside, in exact accordance with what the Conference published in the address of their minutes that year; witness the following—

"We have been called on in the course of last year by some brethren in England, "who fear God and work righteousness, to send them preachers to aid them in the "establishment of a *SIMILAR* system. With this request we have complied, and the "result has been, that several societies have been formed on the Beverley and Hull circuits; considerable progress has been made in the erection of two chapels, while that "of another is in contemplation; and two respectable brethren from Yorkshire have "attended our Conference on behalf of those societies with whom we have formed a "*union*, and appointed two preachers to labour among them."

See address of the preachers of the Primitive Wesleyan Methodist Conference, begun in Dublin, 29th June, 1825, to the members of their societies throughout Ireland.

by, and said, "Now you hear what Mr. Averill says," and I observed to Mr. Averill, "I am really pleased, Sir, to see you in so kind and liberal a spirit. I must acknowledge I thought you narrow and severe in the committee meeting; but it really delights me to see you so different now, and I trust on this liberal plan of proceeding, we shall go on happily together, promoting the great design of christianity." He seemed much pleased, and said "*he believed we should.*" I also remarked to Mr. M'Afee, at the meeting, that he himself observed one day when we were talking together, that he had often thought, if he had a congregation of his own, he would not have any of them to meet in class. This was going further than we went, as we did not object to those members who preferred it, meeting in classes conducted on the old plan; so long as other members who preferred a different mode of meeting were allowed to have their own choice. This reply was deemed quite satisfactory by our friends, and the meeting closed with a request that I would write you the result.

It is clear that though we and our Irish friends agree in the *essentials*, we do not in all the *peculiarities* of the systems, which we respectively advocate. We each naturally think that our own system is the most consonant with the Scriptures, reason, and even with original Methodism. I have more than once offered to discuss the merits of the case in writing, giving Mr. M'Afee all the advantage of his abundant leisure, while I, on the other hand, have scarcely a minute to call my own; as I am well persuaded that it would prevent those many desultory conversations which are apt to excite more feeling than calm reasoning. But this he declines. As, however, you have offered some observations on our views, which appear to me a little hasty, and which probably originated in some misconception, I will offer a few general remarks on the whole subject, which I hope will not at any rate have the effect of widening the breach between us.

It will be perfectly clear to you that it is not a question of *doctrine*, but of *system*, about which we are divided; and as our original agreement was, that you would assist us, provided we agreed with you in *three* particulars—giving no sacraments, holding no meetings in canonical hours, and having representation—which *three* things we had previously adopted, and still hold to, we think Mr. M'Afee ought not to have prematurely agitated the minds of any of our friends on the subject, and we think you would not have recommended so public a meeting as you did in your letter, had you reflected sufficiently on all the circumstances of the case, and the consequences which might follow. In addition to the communications to which I have already adverted, I had made a statement in the introduction to the second edition of my late Pamphlet, '*Observations on the System of Wesleyan Methodism*,' headed in capital letters 'Church Methodism,' and which I took with me to Dublin—that "the Church Methodists have established the same *general discipline*, and hold the same *essential* doctrines as the Conference Methodists, and like them, appeal to the canonical Scriptures of the old and new Testament; and to Mr. Wesley's sermons and notes on the new Testament; and as to their union with the Church, they hope that they are thereby only standing in the old ways, and inquiring for the old paths: they don't forget what Mr. Wesley said,

"They that leave the church leave the Methodists; and further than that I have never engaged to go;" and had not Mr. M'Afee agitated the discussion here, we should not, I believe, have had one word on the subject. It has, however, been hitherto confined to a few, and if proper care be taken, it will not probably be further known, unless you are determined to drag us into a public discussion, which we should think very unwise, and into which, you may rest assured, we should enter with great reluctance; though, if compelled, we shall not shrink,* relying on the goodness of our cause, the purity of our intentions, and the intelligence and respectability of those whose counsel we have taken from various quarters.

Since Mr. M'Afee has started his objection, I have consulted with several of the principal clergymen, and those of the highest character in our own town and neighbourhood, and am much encouraged to find, that they are decidedly of opinion that our system is sufficiently guarded, and would be injured if it were narrowed, and required a strict conformity to doctrines contained in any number of volumes written by any fallible man (however wise and good he might have been,) and which in all probability, when closely examined would be found inconsistent with one another, at least as to minor points. When I consider that those clergymen differ as to minor doctrines themselves, their opinion, (which on this subject has been uniform) is entitled to the greater respect. Such indeed is their character and influence, that I am morally certain, if even we ourselves felt disposed to come into your measures, we could not do so with any reasonable hope of success. We are churchmen, and as such wish sincerely to act in unison with the clergy; and we feel well assured, that the character of those who approve of our system will be a sufficient recommendation of its excellence, and a guard against any attack, wherever these gentlemen are known. The argument of authority, however valuable, has nevertheless its limits, and we are quite willing to subject it to the most rigid examination, appealing to the scriptures, to reason, experience, and to original Methodism.

The principal objections brought by Mr. M'Afee against our plan are three:—1. That it is popery, and not protestantism, to make the trustees of the chapels, or a district meeting, the judges of what doctrines a preacher is to deliver; as it is erecting a standard of supposed truth in their minds. 2. That no society can long hold together, when the preachers are not bound as to what they shall preach, and that consequently divisions will be made. 3. That though it is true, Mr. Wesley set out on this liberal plan, (which would be very excellent if it could be perpetuated) yet he was obliged to alter it. To each of these objections I shall endeavour to make a short reply.

But let our system be first clearly defined, as far as relates to the question under consideration. We profess to believe the doctrines contained in the canonical Scriptures of the old and new Testament, and the *essential* doctrines contained in the 8 vols. of sermons and notes on the new Testament, by Mr. Wesley; giving the trustees power of summoning all the travelling preachers in the district, and all the leaders, trustees, stewards, and local preachers in the circuit, to form a

* We regret, however, now to be compelled to publish.

special district meeting, to sit in judgment on any preacher who shall be accused of being erroneous in doctrine, deficient in abilities, or immoral in conduct; and if he be found guilty of any of these, to be suspended till the next meeting of Conference; and that when the preachers are tried on appeal, the preachers and representatives shall sit together, being then in their *judicial* capacity, but shall sit separate as in *legislative* body.

This, as far as the district meeting is concerned, is precisely the law in the Conference Connexion, and seems very reasonable. As it relates to laymen having a right to sit in judgment along with the preachers (and properly speaking, both are laymen) on appeals by the preachers from the decision of a district meeting, though it is certainly in opposition to the mode adopted both by the Conference Methodists and yourselves; yet we think it would answer many valuable purposes, and be on the same principle as the Court of Arches in our own Church, and the House of Lords, which consists of spiritual and temporal persons. The House of Lords can decide as a court of appeal, independently of the House of Commons. Now then for the first objection, that it is popery. I contend that in both Connexions, the Conference, and our own, a preacher stands or falls as the district meeting, in the first instance, and afterwards the Conference, shall be of opinion that his doctrines are or are not such as he engages to preach. Whether there be an hundred articles drawn out, or he engages to preach the *essential* doctrines in the volumes and notes, still in both cases it is clear, that the district meeting, and Conference become his judges, and the practical question is not, whether he do, or do not, preach according to agreement, but whether they *think* he does. It is clear then that his security is not in any articles he signs, but in the construction his judges put upon them, and his sermons; but that this is popery, I deny. They claim no infallibility; they are only the expositors of the articles, whether they relate to what is termed *essential* doctrines, or to those which may be enumerated in any given creed, or contained in a number of volumes. Were the trustees or the Conference to profess that they possessed the right to add to the scriptures such traditionary matter as they judged necessary to the completion of Revelation, or could decree doctrines (properly such) in addition to the scriptures, it would be popery. But as far as Mr. M'Afee's objection goes, I cannot perceive any material difference between the principle which in this respect is adopted by the Conference connexion, yourselves, and us. You lay down certain doctrines (all contained in the volumes and notes) believing them to be methodistical, and if any preacher preaches contrary to them, the Conference has power to expel him. I understand from Mr. M'Afee, you expelled a preacher for not believing the doctrine of perfection, as explained by Mr. Wesley. The Conference Methodists have also now their creed, and even their catechism; and like our Irish friends, give the power of exclusion to the Conference, if they think a preacher erroneous in doctrine, deficient in abilities, or immoral in conduct. With regard to their preachers designed for foreign stations, the missionary committee, or a select number of preachers, determine on their case. I remember we had a preacher in Beverley, some years ago, of the name of Powel, who was refused as a missionary, because he held Dr. Clarke's

notions respecting the eternal sonship of Christ. Nay, Dr. Clarke himself, even as president of the Conference, called on the young men to declare their belief in the eternal sonship of Christ, though he was professedly labouring to overthrow it in his commentary : and when Mr. Powell referred the preachers to the fact of retaining Dr. Clarke as a preacher, since he held the same opinions as himself, he was answered, that Dr. Clarke would not injure the Connexion by them : and yet Mr. Watson, a popular preacher in the very same Connexion, has laboured, in his reply to the Doctor, to shew that his opinions are extremely dangerous. Now allow me to ask, whether according to Mr. M'Afee's reasoning, all this is not on the principle of popery ? What security had Mr. Powell, or any of the preachers who have been received into the Conference Connexion, or into your own, but the *opinion* of those preachers who were appointed judges of their doctrines ? It does not avail to say, that in the cases referred to, there was a standard of doctrines for the preachers ; for that standard must vary according to the medium through which it is seen, and there can be no doubt, as all the biographers of Mr. Wesley acknowledge, (even Mr. Henry Moore) that his opinions on minor subjects varied. Beside, are not the members of a special district meeting amongst the Conference Methodists at liberty to dismiss any preacher who should be found deficient in abilities ? And yet there is no rule by which to try his abilities, other than their own judgment. Again, a preacher is also very properly made subject to a district meeting for his conduct ; and if that be found immoral, he is liable to be dismissed : but to what rules of morality he is to be made subject, is not so certain ; as some things are esteemed a breach of moral conduct by the rules of Methodism, and the writings of its ablest preachers, of which it may be questioned whether or not they are made to be so in the Bible ; and certainly, if they are believed by the Conference preachers, or yours, they have little effect, and those preachers may be said, according to their own profession, to "hold the truth in unrighteousness." You will of course perceive I refer to the rules respecting spirituous liquors, and the use of tobacco. If a district meeting chose to represent a man as unfit for the Christian ministry, who has formed a habit of drinking dry spirits, they certainly would have the power ; and if Dr. Clarke (your learned countryman) is to be believed, no man can be a good gospel minister who uses tobacco !

It will be seen then from these three instances, that every preacher in the Dissenting Conference Connexion is subject to a trial by a district meeting, relative to *doctrine, abilities, and moral conduct*, of which this meeting is to be the judge ; and so much was Mr. M'Afee struck with this, that he said it was popery, and denied that the Conference preachers were subject to any such trial ! I may be told, perhaps, that there is no use in quoting the authority of Mr. M'Afee, and that you readily allow that there is no ground for charging either us, or the Dissenting Conference Preachers, with any approach to popery in this particular ; but that still a district meeting, or even the Conference, is not sufficient to prevent the possibility of a change in doctrine being effected : and Mr. M'Afee told me a short time ago, that he would never take a part in forwarding any system where the preachers and

leaders, &c. were not bound like yourselves, viz. that they would not attempt to make any alteration in it; and he appealed to the Church of England in proof of the principle. Unfortunately, however for the argument, those who have the power of altering our Prayer Book, never bound themselves up in any way whatever; and an addition to the 39 Articles could be made the next session of Parliament, or any part of them could be taken away. Indeed I imagine no such engagement was ever before entered into by any religious Society on earth, as that, at no future period, any of its preachers and members should be at liberty even to propose any alteration in their system. I fancy I might, with some shew of reason, have retorted the charge of popery in this; as there is too much appearance of infallibility, since it goes on the supposition that whatever alteration may take place, either in public affairs, or in your own Society, nothing more wise and excellent can ever be proposed than you have already discovered. At any rate, whether it approach to popery or not, it is certainly no part of *original* Methodism. Mr. Wesley acted on a different principle, as appears from the first Conference he held, and especially from his letter to the Rev. Vincent Perronet. When speaking of the origin of class meetings, which it appears had no existence till four years after the first Conference, (and which originated in the adoption of means to collect money for paying the Society's debt in Bristol,) Mr. Wesley says—"Some objected—There were no such meetings (as class meetings) when I came into Society first, and why should there now? I do not understand these things: this changing one thing after another continually." "It was (says he) easily answered. It is a pity but they had been at first: but we knew not then either the need or the benefit of them. Why we use them, you will readily understand, if you read over the rules of the Society. That with regard to *these little prudential helps*, we are continually changing one thing after another, is not a weakness or a fault, (as you imagine,) but a peculiar advantage which we enjoy. By these means we declare them all to be merely *prudential*; not *essential*, not of *divine institution*. We prevent as far as in us lies our growing formal or dead. *We are always open to instruction, willing to be wiser every day than we were before, and to change whatever we can change for the better.*" This passage certainly stands in remarkable contrast with your law, which allows no alteration on any account, nor under any circumstances. If it were needful to add more on this subject, I could probably cite nothing better than the quotations from Chillingworth, Dr. Watts, and Mr. Richard Watson, with which I closed my '*Observations on Wesleyan Methodism.*'

2nd objection. That no society can long be held together, where the preachers are not bound as to what they shall preach, and consequently divisions will be made.

This objection I have in part anticipated; and I would further observe, that this would be true, if it applied to *essential* doctrines, or to such rules as must be observed to preserve necessary order; but it is certainly not so, as it relates to their private difference of opinion, as to minor doctrines, or little prudential regulations. If it were even conceded that religious discussions in Christian Societies are great evils,

it does not appear to me that our plan would have a tendency to create them, but the very contrary. I do not, however, allow that such discussion, conducted in a kind and Christian spirit (and otherwise it is only an abuse of it) is an evil at all; it naturally encourages an enquiring mind, and though it may be called by the hard names of disputation, cavelling, &c. yet that does not alter the thing.

There are two ways of attempting to prevent discussion and difference of opinion—the one is by a strict profession of *uniformity*; the other is, by leaving mankind to form their own judgment on minor doctrines of religion, and to effect a scriptural and reasonable *comprehension*: and I believe, that there is much more probability of success on the latter, than on the former plan. Not far distant from the place where I now write, I know a society which was formed on such strict principles, that it was supposed almost impossible for any disputes to arise among the members. But experience shewed the contrary, as indeed might have been anticipated; for persons, who would form such a union, would be apt to place too great a value in uniformity, and be led to regard the smallest difference of opinion as a matter of moment: they at last fell to disputing on some questions of the smallest possible importance, and the consequence was, a division of the society. On the other hand, societies founded upon liberal principles are, for the most part, free from contentions; as for instance, the Bible Society, Missionary Societies, &c. and, let it be considered, that the Church Methodist Society is founded upon the same principles as those recognised (to use your amendment of the circular) by the “Bible Society.” We consider ourselves a company of Churchmen, united together for the purpose of promoting genuine piety in our own Church, holding the *essential* doctrines, taught by Mr. Wesley, and desirous of reviving that pure spirit of Christianity, which we believe animated himself and his first associates in the great work he began in these kingdoms.

If you say, as Mr. M’Afee has done, that you have no objections to offer to our admitting into our Connexion persons of all persuasions, who hold those doctrines, usually termed *orthodox*; and that you would extend this even to local preachers; but that to permit the travelling preachers to differ even in *non-essential* doctrines; though district meetings (composed of preachers and leaders, &c.) should possess power to prevent their preaching those peculiarities, ought not to be allowed, as it would cause confusion (and both Mr. M’Afee and Mr. M’Conkey afterwards contended, that if a pious and respectable local preacher offered us his services, however excellent he might be, we ought to reject him, if he held even Baxterian sentiments) I would reply, that if even we went so far as to employ preachers of different sentiments, who stated their own views in general terms from the pulpit, it would be difficult to shew that angry disputes would ensue; and for such an opinion, I appeal to ecclesiastical history.

I shall first refer you to a body of Christians, who stand high in the estimation of Christians of all denominations; and whose missionaries, perhaps I may venture to say, are preferred, on the whole, to any other church or society in the world; and to whom, it is certain, Mr. Wesley was principally indebted for the system of Methodism; I mean the Moravians, or “The Renewed Church of the Brethren.”

A late eminent writer observes, "It is not unusual in the Brethren's Church, especially on the Continent, for men to exercise the ministry with edification to their flocks, who differ in sentiment on those tenets which distinguish the Lutherans, and Reformed, or Calvinists. In all the regular settlements of the Brethren, persons live together in Christian unity, who, from education, or other circumstances, have a predilection for the tenets of the Lutheran and Calvinist church. This truly Catholic spirit has been attended with very beneficial effects to the Church of the Brethren. It has preserved its members from sectarianism and bigotry, and from angry controversies among themselves and with other Christians, on subjects which relate either solely to the externals of christianity, or to doctrines too deep to be fully understood by man in his present state of imperfect knowledge. If such persons, in their daily intercourse with each other, find that this diversity of opinion on some controverted subjects of theology, or the mere circumstantialities of religion, may exist with the more scriptural faith in Jesus, and with the purest Christian morality, the natural consequence is, that a disputatious sectarian and bigotted spirit will give place to a meek, humble, and tolerant disposition. In such a congregation, provided its members submit to the teaching of God's spirit, the asperities of prejudice, and the obstinacy of private opinions, will yield to the softening influence of the gospel. Such were the effects produced by the consiliatory measures adopted by the renewed Church of the Brethren in its very infancy, and they have not been diminished. On the contrary, the increased acquaintance and connexion the Brethren formed in Gaul, Britain, America, and other countries, with pious persons of various religious denominations, satisfied them that all minor differences may be successfully merged in the Christian character, when faith, hope, and charity predominate and sway the conduct."

On the Sacred Bond.

"Upon the whole then it is evident, that the sacred bond which unites the members of the Brethren's Church, consists neither in a uniform adherence to certain external regulations and ceremonies, (for these, unless positively enjoined in the word of God, may be changed) nor in an identity of religious sentiment and language in every possible object of Christian faith; for in this respect the opinion of the Christian Church, and the ideas of its individual members have at all times been diversified. But the union of the Brethrens' is maintained by an accordance of the heart with evangelical truth and its effects, as taught in the Holy Scriptures. It is the unity of the spirit, and the concord of religious principle and feeling."

ON THE

Unity of the Moravian and Lutheran Churches.

"Let it not be however thought that the Brethren, in their zeal to avoid a sectarian spirit, ever carried their liberality so far as to make it a matter of indifference what a man believed, or how his faith influenced his conduct. God forbid! there are doctrines so essential to

human salvation, and works so intimately connected with faith, that unless a man believes the former, and does the latter, he cannot be a Christian. Faith in the *essential* doctrines of the gospel, and the evidenc of its reality in a holy life and conversation, have ever been and still are the substance of the Brethren's preaching, and the *only* test of any person being a member of their Church. These doctrines they profess to derive from no other source than that which is open to all Christians, the Holy Scriptures. They declare in the statutes of their Church—"the Holy Scriptures are and remain the only touch-stone 'and rule by which our doctrine must be examined, and our whole lives 'regulated.'"

The next instance to which I beg your attention, is one of a still earlier date; and respects a body of Christians who (probably not later than the 4th century) bore their noble testimony against those errors which even then were becoming prevalent, the Waldenses. "A new era in the history of the Waldenses commenced with the Reformation. They sought an early acquaintance with Luther and his coadjutors.—Their agreeing with them in all the *essentials* of religion, naturally paved the way for mutual acts of kindness and a closer union. Thus we find, that in 1560, the Waldenses of Calabria formed an union with Calvin's Church in Geneva, from which they were supplied with ministers."

In unison with these liberal practices and principles, I am happy that I am able to cite such authorities as Luther and Melancthon. On these points of ecclesiastical discipline and rule in which the Brethren differed from him, Luther thus stated his opinion—"Although their exists, according to their confession, some difference between them and us, respecting certain rules and ceremonies, we ought to remember, that at no period have the customs, orders, and discipline been exactly the same in all Churches; nor can this be the case, because local circumstances, the difference of nations, and the constant changes which take place in human affairs, would render such uniformity impracticable." Similar testimonies in their favour, may be found in the works of several of Luther's principal assistants. Of these I shall only quote the following, by the celebrated Philip Melancthon, who, in a letter to the Brethren, written in 1535, expresses himself thus:—"Seeing we are of one mind respecting the *essential* articles of the Christian faith, let us receive each other in love. No difference or alteration in customs or ceremonies shall alienate or disunite us. The holy Apostle Paul speaks frequently of differences in ceremonies, and strongly forbids Christians to separate from each other on that account, though it is a source of violent contentions in the world. The self-denying exercises and strict discipline, which prevail in your Church, truly do not displease me. Would to God that they were more seriously attended to in our Churches! Take this, then, as my opinion concerning you, I wish from my very heart, that all who love the gospel, and desire that the name of Christ may be widely extended and glorified, may imbibe and exercise to each other, true Christian charity and meekness; and chiefly aim at promoting the glory of Christ by their doctrine, that they may not ruin themselves by personal malice, and baneful discord, especially with regard to those things which, NOT BEING ESSENTIAL, ought never to create dissention."

If further proofs were wanting to shew that Christian congregations can, and do, maintain a spirit of good will and kind feeling to one another, and to their ministers, even where these ministers hold different opinions on the minor doctrines of Christianity, I would instance our own Church, whose Articles are so drawn up, as to make it not less difficult to prove whether they are Arminian or Calvinistic, than it is to prove the same as to the Epistle to the Romans. You and I believe that the Arminian doctrines are contained in both, but we should find it very difficult to make many of our friends believe so, some of whom are confessedly our superiors in every thing, which can assist them in forming a sound opinion. And when we consider, that Cranmer, Latimer, and Hooper, who drew the Articles up, were all Arminians, it looked as though they rather aimed at a *comprehension* than a *uniformity* in what they did. The consequence is, that we have both the Calvinistic and the Arminian doctrines delivered from our pulpits without any disturbance or dispute. The same congregation will, as you know, be listening with delight to an Arminian one part of the day, and to a Calvinist or Baxterian the other; the natural effect is, what is stated by the respectable author I have quoted, to be the effect among the Moravians; "that a disputatious sectarian and bigotted spirit gives place to a meek, humble, and tolerant disposition." Where, let me ask, will you find these graces in greater perfection, than in the Established Church of England and Ireland? It pervades every order and condition, and puts to everlasting shame all the little narrow paltry proceedings and sectarian principles of those close societies, which, in a greater or less degree, have lost her truly Catholic spirit. Look at our beloved Sovereign, the spiritual head equally of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and the Episcopal Church of England; and suffer me to remind you of what, at the time, filled us both with admiration—the courteous kind behaviour, and liberal principles, of one of the first divines now living, your own excellent Archbishop. Suppose, when you and I had called on him, he had informed us, that lay-preaching was not agreeable to the economy of the Established Church; and that he could not give us any countenance or assistance at any rate, unless our preachers signed the Articles of the Church of England; or drew their own up in such general terms, that both Arminians and Calvinists might sign: that, besides, we must oblige the preachers to write their sermons, and use forms of prayers, &c. &c. &c. Should we have returned with the exalted ideas we did of his Grace's liberality? I trow not. Let me, then, beg you to press it upon our dear friends in Dublin, to remember, that if you have been forgiven all that debt of irregularity, they must not seize their fellow-servants by the throat, and demand payment of all they imagine we owe them on the same score. You have professed yourselves members of the Established Church, and as such need permission to carry on, consistently, your lay-preaching and extemporè services; but we have never professed ourselves members of your society; so far from it you promised to help us, on our agreeing with you in *three* things, which we have steadily kept to, and intend to keep to, and (as I purpose by and bye to shew) to keep to more practically than yourselves. And yet, because we do not intend to adopt more than the "*fundamental*" part of your system (the very thing we agreed

to at your Conference) your preachers here threaten us with desertion, and prophesy how deeply they shall involve us in pecuniary difficulties. If this is to be the return for our generosity to them, and the risk we have been induced to run, we will commit our cause to the righteous Judge of all, and make an appeal for subscriptions to the British public; not doubting but the purity, orthodoxy, and utility of our plan, sanctioned as it is by the first minds, and best Churchmen in the kingdom, will bear the strictest examination; and, in a word, is such as to encourage us to believe that a kind Providence will watch over it.

There is one more example to which I would appeal, and I have done, and that is to *Original Methodism*. Was it Mr. Wesley's wish to bring together a body of Christians, who, always hearing the same sentiments from the pulpit and in the class, should *be all*, as much as possible, of one mind as to the *non-essential*, as well as *essential* doctrines of the Gospel? If it was so, I confess I have entertained mistaken ideas of Primitive Methodism. I imagined, that if the members of his society were hut sincere and pious people, and believed the Bible to be the word of God, and that our Saviour was the Son of God, who had died to bring all to heaven that believed in Him, he did not enquire or care what their views might be on minor doctrines. Now then for his own words:—"The distinguishing marks of a Methodist are not his opinions of any sort. His assenting to this or that sort of religion, his embracing any particular set of notions, his espousing the judgment of one man or another, are all quite wide of the point. Whoever, therefore, imagines that a Methodist is a man of such or of such an opinion, is grossly ignorant of the whole affair: he mistakes the truth totally. We believe, indeed, that all scripture is given by the inspiration of God; and herein we are distinguished from Jews, Turks, and Infidels. We believe this written word of God to be the only and sufficient rule both of Christian faith and practice, and herein we are distinguished from the Socinians and Arians. But as to all opinions, which do not strike at the root of Christianity, we think, and let think. So that whatsoever they are, whether right or wrong, they are no distinguishing marks of a Methodist. By Methodists, I mean a people who profess to pursue (in whatsoever degree they have attained) holiness of heart and life, inward and outward conformity in all things to the revealed will of God, whose religion consists in an uniform resemblance of the great object of it; in a steady imitation of Him they worship, in all His imitable perfections; more particularly in justice, mercy, and truth, or universal love filling the heart and governing the life." I also supposed, that so far from expecting or wishing to see that exact uniformity in the opinions of his Society, which some of your friends think so desirable, Mr. Wesley was afraid of the very opposite. So it appears, for he tells us, he held a monthly meeting for the express purpose of shewing the Methodists that the divine blessing ordinarily accompanies the faithful preaching of the Gospel, whatever may be the peculiarities with which it may be connected; and if any thing could prove Mr. Wesley's true liberality of sentiment, it was this extraordinary meeting. Had such meetings been kept up in England and Ireland, depend upon it I should not have had the trouble of writing, nor you of reading this letter.

"The thing," says Mr. Wesley, "which I was greatly afraid of all this time, and which I resolved by every method to prevent, was a narrowness of spirit, a party zeal, a being straightened in our own bowels; that miserable bigotry, which makes many so unready to believe that there is any work of God but among themselves. I thought it might be a help against this, frequently to read to all who were willing to hear, the accounts I received from time to time of the work which God is carrying on in the earth, both in our own and in other countries; not among *us* alone, but among those of *various* opinions and denominations. For this I allotted an evening every month, and I find no cause to repent of my labour. It is generally a time of strong consolation to those who love God, and all mankind for his sake, as well as breaking down the partition walls, *which either the craft of the devil or the folly of men*, has built up; and of encouraging every child of God to say, (O! when shall it once be?) 'Whosoever *doeth* the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother and sister and mother.'

But what will you say, when I remind you that Mr. Wesley's first preachers enjoyed the same liberty with regard to their sentiments, which the private members did; and though Mr. Whitfield frequently insisted on Calvinistic doctrines, Mr. Wesley did not wish him by any means to separate from him. So far from that, he met him half way, adopting a sentiment, which I conceive to be genuine Baxterianism. He says—"I believe, that in those eminently styled the elect, (if such there be) the grace of God is so far irresistible, that they cannot but believe, and be finally saved. But I cannot believe that all those must be damned, in whom it does not irresistibly work! Or, that there is one soul on earth who has not, and never had, any other kind of grace, than such as does in fact increase his damnation, and was designed of God so to do. With regard to the next head, (final perseverance,) I believe, that there is a state attainable in this life, from which a man cannot finally fall. That he has attained this who is, according to St. Paul's account, a new creature; that is, who can say—'Old things have passed away, all things (in me) have become new.' And I do not deny, that all those eminently styled the elect, will infallibly persevere to the end."

Mr. M'Afee had said so much against this doctrine of Mr. Wesley's, that when, in our last meeting, I read this extract, he denied that it was from Mr. Wesley, until I offered to shew the book; and a friend in the meeting said, he had read it from Mr. Wesley that day. Mr. M'Afee has since given up the question, whether in this particular we copy Mr. Wesley. This cannot be denied; but then he argues against original Methodism, because Mr. Wesley found it would not do, and Mr. Whitfield left him. I have already observed, that it was not Mr. Wesley's wish to separate from Mr. Whitfield, or any one, only thus differing from him; and I contend, that as we are attempting to tread in Mr. Wesley's steps, there does not seem any reason why you should hesitate to afford us any assistance in your power.

My dear Sir, do not be offended or grieved, if I attempt to show that we have, in my opinion, as good or better title to the claim of Primitive Wesleyan Methodism than yourselves, so far from our

approaching (as Mr. M'Afee imagined) to Independents. 1. Mr. Wesley, in forming his system, naturally applied for advice to the clergy of the Establishment; and his first Conference was formed of clergymen entirely, except one layman. *Your* first Conference had but one clergyman in it, if one.—2. Mr. Wesley had one clergyman or more at most of his early Conferences, to be witnesses of what was done. *So we wish.* But *we* believe *you* have not had one.—3. He had only two services in his chapel on a Sunday—morning and evening. *So we purpose.* But *you* have three; thereby (wherever this is the case) making it morally impossible for the congregation to attend their parish churches. It could not be expected that a person would attend four or five *public* services, and sometimes attend a class meeting too, as I think would be the case with your own class, if they attend church.—4. Mr. Wesley made the Bible the only standard of truth to his first preachers and people, calling for no subscription to either his own sermons or those of others, retaining the power of silencing any preacher, who should contradict any *essential* or important articles of religion. *You*, on the contrary, call on all the preachers and representatives to declare their belief of all the doctrines in the 8 vols of sermons and notes by Mr. Wesley. *We* think it quite sufficient that they should profess their belief in the *essential* or *fundamental* doctrines contained in those volumes, and so think the clergy to whom I have before referred.—5. Mr. Wesley at first laid very little stress upon even his class meetings; certainly not so much as upon the monthly meeting I have before adverted to, and of which he speaks so highly. Class meetings, he acknowledges, he did not derive from the Bible, and calls them “little *prudential* helps, not *essential*, not of *divine* institution.” *We* view them as Mr. Wesley did; but we are of opinion, that while we retain the old method of meeting them, as being preferred by those who unite with us from the Conference Connexion, it would be wise to meet others of them differently, viz. by reading the scriptures in them, and encouraging a pious conversation, allowing all to refer as often and as fully to their own experience as they choose, but not obliging them to speak.—6. Mr. Wesley left his constitution and discipline open, as may be seen by what he says respecting these very meetings. *You*, on the contrary, have settled all these matters as firmly as though those who formed them had been infallible; and even made any member of Conference to exclude himself, if he propose any alterations or improvement in your constitution.—7. Mr. Wesley was anxious to see the increase of piety in the Church of England, although the Methodists might not be the immediate instruments in promoting it: whereas I fear a party spirit possesses some of *your* preachers. Mr. Kingston knows how much he was grieved to hear Mr. M'Afee argue as he did on the subject against me, in the hearing of the Rev. Mr. Greig; who, while he expressed himself very doubtfully respecting Primitive Wesleyan Methodism in Ireland, declared he would rush through fire and water to defend Church Methodism, as I described it to exist in England. Mr. Kingston will remember, that I contended we had no call, as Church Methodists, “to build on another man’s foundation”; and I dare say, neither he nor a young gentleman who walked home with me, has forgotten how Mr. M'Afee vacillated.

The fear, too, expressed by your Conference, lest we should be in too close alliance with the Established Church, I confess rather startled me.

Although it is impossible, without some legislative enactment, that unconsecrated places of worship and lay preachers can be placed under the episcopal jurisdiction, which I never contemplated, yet as we are strictly members of the Church, and wish to see an increase of piety in it, we are anxious to use every proper means in our power (however inconsiderable that power may be) to effect the purpose. But this, we are persuaded, is not to be done by merely collecting together a Society in the Church, which shall be quite insulated from their brethren.—What good should we do in Beverley or Hull, were we to follow your example in Dublin, to hold three public services in our Chapels, which, though not in Church hours, yet so near them, that in point of practice, they would, in time, have all the effect ; as we should never find many people attending those services, and also attending the Church, except for Sacraments. The real difference between us is this (as I have intimated before) we wish to act on those principles, which, we are confident from the very foundation of *original* Methodism, rather than those *altered* ones, which supported the system in 1816, when your Connexion was formed in Ireland.

Dissenters, as well as Churchmen, have seen and lamented the departure of that pure philanthropic heavenly zeal which animated the first founders of Methodism. If our friends in Ireland sincerely wish to catch that spirit, which we feel assured many of them do, we trust that it will not abate their attachment to us, that we aspire to surpass them in this excellence ; and certainly it is not discouraging to us, that, on an accurate comparison of *your* system and *ours*, by many men of eminence in the country, *ours* receives the decided preference. The Rev. Mr. Greig also, as Mr. Kingston can witness, did not hesitate a moment to declare, that that was the first time in his life he had ever heard a description of Methodism of which he approved.

It must be well known to you, that some of the biographers of Mr. Wesley were under strong temptations to suppress some of his sentiments. Dr. Whitehead, especially, was strongly solicited to keep out of sight what Mr. Wesley had written with his own hand ; and hence the greatest difficulty in coming to an accurate knowledge of *original* Methodism. There is one source, however, left untainted, and to which we may have recourse, without suspicion—the testimony of one of Mr. Wesley's most intimate friends, and a man whose eminent talents and whose distinguished piety, joined to an intimate acquaintance with Mr. W.'s early proceedings, add a weight to his sentiments, which render them most highly important in the present instance. You will of course know that I refer to the late eminent Mr. Surgeon Hey, of Leeds. In a paper which he exhibited to the Conference, in 1781, we find the following remarks :—"The purpose of a steady attachment to the Church of England was the profession of the first Methodists. Witness every thing that has been done and written upon the subject. The most solemn appeals have been made for the sincerity of this profession. And, indeed, for a time, this was their constant practice as well as profession. To be a Methodist, and a constant attendant

"upon the Church service, were strictly united. To be the leader of a
 "sect, was deprecated as 'hell fire.' And, therefore, those who assisted
 "in some parts of the ministerial functions were constantly reminded,
 "that they were not to consider themselves as ministers, but only as
 "persons designed to exhort a careless nation to flee from the wrath to
 "come. They were restrained from the exercise of those parts of the
 "ministerial functions which were judged to be peculiar to ministers.
 "Great opposition has indeed been made from time to time against
 "this regulation by those who saw the absurdity of being ministers,
 "without exercising all the duties of that office; and who had no
 "attachment to the Church of England, but the steady opposition made
 "to any encroachments upon the original idea of mere helpers to the
 "ministry, showed how firmly that principle was rivetted. Notwith-
 "standing the first ideas of a dissent, and the repeated care to avoid it,
 "a dissent for many years has been gradually approaching, and will
 "inevitably be the consequence, without some vigorous and self-
 "denying efforts to prevent it. The intervals of the Church service
 "are so filled up with meetings, public and private, that there is no time
 "for instructing families in the best seasons of leisure. Many of the
 "most eminent in the Society rarely come to Church, their time being
 "filled up with other exercises; and some never carry their children
 "to Church. Ministers, who think it their duty to form Societies for
 "private instruction, are looked upon with an envious eye (though this
 "has been publicly declared to be the thing wished for) by persons upon
 "whom the preachers can have influence, are requested not to attend
 "their private instruction. It has ever been made inconsistent with
 "their attachment to the Methodist Society. Preachers are discouraged
 "from entering into the Church, though a support of the Church is the
 "professed motive of the irregular way of preaching. If any attach-
 "ment to, and improvement of, the Church of England, is to be the
 "real issue of these separate preachings, some mode of coalescence with
 "the Church must be entered upon and regularly pursued. If a
 "minister believes and teaches the doctrine of original sin, justification
 "through the merits of Christ, the necessity of the sanctifying grace
 "for the spirit and holiness of life, he should be considered as a
 "brother. Contentions about the other points have done inconceivable
 "mischief. When this coalescence must take place, is easy to deter-
 "mine; it must be while the societies have a considerable degree of
 "vital religion, or it will never be done. First principles will grow
 "weaker, the farther we recede from them; and a complete separation
 "will gradually, and, as it were, insensibly come on. Much self-denial
 "is necessary to complete such a plan; but it is worthy of all our
 "efforts." In this we conceive we behold a faithful picture of *original*
 Methodism, and which is, on the whole, what we wish to see established.
 We are persuaded it cannot be denied, that in endeavouring to keep
 up the most intimate connexion with the Church, we much more closely
 copy Mr. Wesley's plan than yourselves.

There is another view of your system, which certainly in our
 opinion, shows it to be very little superior to the Dissenting or Confer-
 ence system; and which we regard as very defective, and exceedingly
 objectionable. You have so arranged matters as to place the balance of

power in the hands of the travelling preachers; for though you admit representatives into your Conference, yet in disputed cases, you appoint a committee to determine, composed of an equal number of preachers and representatives, but the chairman is invariably to be a *preacher, with the casting vote*; so that if there be 12 representatives and 12 preachers, there will be 13 preachers' votes. To say nothing of the moral certainty of some of the representatives always voting with the preachers, it will be seen that the preachers have the power as certain as though they could insure a large majority. On *our* plan, no law can become binding on the Societies at large, without the consent of a majority of the *representatives*, as well as a majority of the *preachers*. As then we left the Conference Connexion, because the preachers were separating an immense body of people from the Church; and also, because they had, as preachers, reserved the power of making the laws, &c. in their own hands, we should be very inconsistent to establish another system, where these evils are not provided against; and, in fact, where one evil fully exists—the power of the preachers, and the other exists in part.

I come now to the last objection, viz. “Mr. Wesley’s *original* plan did not answer.”

This is a singular objection to come from one who professes to take a part in establishing *Primitive Wesleyan Methodism*, especially when Mr. Wesley himself lamented to many of his friends *privately*, that the preachers had diverted him *from his original design*. We learn from Mr. Wesley, that he did not wish Mr. Whitfield to leave his Society because he adhered to his own Calvinistic doctrines; so far from it, he wished him to exercise his own liberty in this respect, knowing that many of those points in which they differed were of too high and mysterious a nature to admit of any absolute and indisputable solution, and that Mr. Whitfield insisted on the necessity of a holy life as well as himself. While on the subject of Calvinism, at which Mr. McAfee is so much enraged as to call it a doctrine of devils, &c. &c. and has scarcely common patience with those who hold it, I beg to remark, that though I am not aware that there is one peculiarity of that doctrine which I believe, as it stands opposed to moderate Arminianism, yet I can, in the sight of God declare, that I feel the same attachment to a pious Calvinist, as I do to a pious Arminian: and I exceedingly regret any measures which have the tendency of dividing those whom Christ has united. I have already observed, that Mr. Wesley regretted that Mr. Whitfield should have ceased to preach with him, because he differed with him in what Mr. Wesley regarded as a *mere opinion*, which had nothing to do with genuine piety. Mr. Fletcher was also of Mr. Wesley’s mind in this particular; and I suppose you will allow, that perhaps no man since the days of the Apostle Paul better understood the subject. As to Mr. Wesley, he says in his 13th Journal, p. 115, to a friend—“You have admirably “well expressed what I mean by an *opinion* contradistinguished from “*essential doctrine*. Whatever is compatible with love to Christ, and “a work of grace, I term an opinion; and certainly, the holding *particular election* and *final perseverance* is compatible with these. Mr. “H. and Mr. R. held this, and yet I believe they have Christian ex- “perience. But if so, this is only an *opinion*, it is not subversive of

"the very foundation of Christian experience. It is compatible with love to Christ, and a genuine work of grace: yea many hold it; at whose feet I desire to be found in the day of the Lord Jesus. If, then, I oppose this with my whole strength, *I am a mere bigot still*. And what says Mr. Rowland Hill? (Mr. Wesley's opponent) "As for the *serious and converted* part of Mr. Wesley's congregations, as I by no means think it necessary for any one to be what are commonly called a Calvinist, in order that they may be *Christians*, I can most solemnly declare, however they may judge of me, that I love and honour them not a little."

Mr. Fletcher, on the same subject, remarks—"Since there is so *immaterial* a difference between the moderate Calvinists and the candid Arminians, why do they keep at such a distance from each other? Why do they not publicly give one another the right hand of fellowship, and let the world know they are *brethren*, and will henceforth own, love, and defend each other as such? No *essential difference* keeps them asunder." I can go a little further; I can prove that Mr. Fletcher recommended the establishment of a Society himself, one great object of which, next to preaching the *essential* truths of the Gospel, should be to lessen party differences, and unite a body of people together who agreed in *fundamentals*. For this purpose they were to admit into their pulpits preachers who were moderate Calvinists and moderate Arminians. Not a union of different societies, that being impracticable, but one society (called by any suitable name); as he held that the pharisaism of rigid Arminianism would best yield to the preaching of judicious Calvinists, and the high doctrines of Calvinism would be best overthrown by moderate Arminian preachers; and that thus pharisaism and antinomianism would be destroyed, the Church of Christ sanctified and cleansed, ready to be presented to Christ a glorious Church, "not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing."

I have dwelt the longer on this point, because Mr. M'Afee has said so much on the sad condition our societies would be reduced to, if such a plan should be acted upon as this recommended by the venerable and apostolic vicar of Madeley,* who may be eminently styled the defender (so far as relates to the *essentials*) of the Methodist faith; but who considered the agreement in *three* articles quite sufficient to form a bond of Christian unity—"1. Original sin. 2. Justification by faith. 3. Holiness of heart and life, provided their life be answerable to their doctrines." These he terms *essentials*, and deprecates the idea of insisting on a union of opinions on doctrines which are not involved in these—that "they may agree or disagree, touching absolute decrees on

* The reader will at once perceive how much reason Mr. M'Afee had to quarrel with the liberal principle upon which we were anxious to establish English Church Methodism, when they read the following extract from a letter we received but a few months before from the Dublin Managing Committee:—

"Dear Brethren,

"*Leaders' Rooms, Dublin, Jan. 28, 1825.*

"The communication of the 14th inst. from brothers Mallin and M'Afee, has been extremely gratifying to us; and we feel thankful to the Great Head of the Church, that some are yet to be found in England, who are willing to unite with us in supporting and extending the cause of Primitive Genuine Methodism: that cause which, in the contemplation of its venerable founder, had for its object, *no separating plan*; but, like primitive Christianity, was anxious to fold in its embrace

the one hand, and perfection on the other." But now we have never gone so far as Mr. F. proposed, in his method of destroying what Mr. W. tells us he so much feared, a party spirit, and which St. Paul condemns as a crying sin in the Corinthian Church. It is, perhaps, because we have never sufficiently drank into the same heavenly spirit. —We have certainly approached toward him, in determining that private opinions on the minor and controverted parts of religious belief should not exclude from our pulpits those who could cordially join us in preaching those heart-searching truths, which we have so long heard from the faithful ministers in the Establishment, as well as from the pulpits of Methodist preachers. It is true that few, if any, of us approach so near the doctrine of Calvinism, as Mr. Wesley did, in allowing that there is a state attainable in this life from which a man cannot finally fall; and that he has attained this, who, according to St. Paul's account, is a "new creature," that is, who can say, "old things have passed away, and all things" (in me) "have become new;" "and I do not deny" (says Mr. Wesley) "that all these, eminently styled the elect, will infallibly persevere to the end."

"men of every sect and every clime—the Jew and Gentile, the bond and free, the noble and ignoble; requiring no outward separation, but a departure from iniquity, no doctrinal test, but an agreement in the essentials of Christianity, repentance, faith, and holiness. To assist you in commencing the great work of a restoration to first principles, we send you over, at your request, our brothers Mallin and M'Affee.

We remain, dear Brethren,

Your very sincere friends,

ADAM FORD, } *Preachers.*

ROBERT SMITH, }

BENNET DUGDALE, }

WILLIAM CURRY, }

MARTIN KEENE, }

JOHN CURRY, }

J. W. REED, }

BENJAMIN POYNTZ, }

GEORGE STOKES, }

JOHN STOKES, }

J. J. M'GREGOR, }

Leaders.

WM. CURRY, Jun. }

THOMAS HOEY, }

WM. RICHARDSON, }

JAMES KEENE, }

WILLIAM HEALY, }

ARTHUR KEENE, }

JAMES MALLAY, }

GEORGE TAYLOR, }

WM. BOBINGTON, }

JOHN HAYES, }

NICHOLAS MARTIN, }

Members.

That these sentiments were likewise the sentiments of those who then took a lively interest in the prosperity of Church Methodism, may be seen from the reply which was returned:—

"Beverly, Feb. 4, 1825.

"Dear Brethren,—We have this morning received your excellent letter, which excites in our minds THE SAME FEELINGS AND SENTIMENTS which inspired those who indited it. We are much encouraged by the prospects which we see opening before us; and this is greatly increased by the assistance which you so kindly offer to continue us. Judging from the prompt attention you have given to our request, and your zeal in the same common cause which engages our minds in England, we are encouraged to hope, that you will allow Mr. M'Affee to remain with us till your Conference, especially, as it appears from Mr. Averill's letter, that Mr. Mallin will be obliged to return, for the present, to your country. We hope you will be the more disposed to grant our request, when we inform you, that it is our intention to attempt the erection of a commodious chapel in Beverly, which makes it highly necessary that Mr. M'Affee should return. We remain, dear Brethren, Your's, &c."

ANTHONY ATKINSON

WILLIAM SISSISON

G. C. TAYLOR

JOHN SHEPHERD

JOSEPH TESSEYMAN

R. BAINBRIDGE

R. HASTINGS

JOHN RISPIN

MARK ROBINSON

ROBERT SMELT

BELL ROBINSON

THOMAS BRIGHAM.

The deeds of our chapels will secure the perpetuity of an *orthodox* faith, and exclude the errors of Socinianism and Arianism. Our trustees with the aid of district meetings and the Conference, will be sufficient guards as to minor doctrines, and the steady countenance afforded to the preaching the great truths of the Gospel; and the avoiding, as much as possible, the introduction of controverted points, and matters "of doubtful disputation," will, I trust, realize, in time, all the benefits proposed by *Mr. Fletcher's still more liberal plan*. We conceive, that while, on the whole, the same doctrines are preached as those we have been accustomed to hear from the Methodist pulpits, though preached somewhat more *guardedly* than we have sometimes heard them there, no just cause of complaint can be urged. We have seen what Mr. Fletcher and Mr. Wesley regard as *essential* doctrines, and to those we are firmly attached, and from them never design to swerve; we are willing to engage that, in case our preachers contradict them, they shall be amenable to trial by a district meeting, with appeal to the Conference. But we regard it absurd to expect that either preachers or people should so exactly agree in every minute shade of doctrine, as that there could not be the least possible difference between them. We all know that Mr. W. in this respect differed as much from Arminius as he did from Baxter, and rather more. Mr. Fletcher we believe a safer guide, with respect to these matters, as he devoted much more close attention to the subject, and had a mind peculiarly fitted for it; but then Mr. F. was no more an Arminian than a Calvinist: indeed he ranks Arminius amongst Semi-Pelagians, whose errors he blames for producing high rigid Calvinism. "For my part, (says he) I glory in going as near the Calvinists as I safely can. Some readers will probably think that I have made "the Calvinists too many concessions in the following pages; but I "am persuaded that I have granted them nothing but what they have "a scriptural right to!" Again, Mr. Wesley and Mr. Benson held very different views of sanctification; and I well remember Mr. Edward Hare informing me, that his own notions differed again from Mr. Fletcher's, and I have one of his letters in my possession, in which he intimates, that his private views on some of those controverted points, are such as a narrow-minded Methodist would judge heretical; though Mr. Hare is looked upon in the Dissenting Conference Connexion as one of the ablest defenders of its doctrines. In the Methodist Conference, we know, that the preachers are not only divided as to a variety of opinions advanced by Dr. Clarke; but in those points I am now considering, there are to be found amongst the preachers considerable variation of doctrine, from high Arminianism to low Baxterianism; and no doubt many of them reconcile it to their conscience, because they find their own doctrines in Mr. Wesley's volumes. No one, who impartially examines the matter, can doubt but that Mr. Wesley varied considerably in his views on minor doctrines, as well as on the extent and bearing of more important truths. Dr. Coke himself admits, that Mr. Wesley preached differently in the latter part of his life, to what he did in the early part of his ministry; and allows that he said to an intimate friend of his, a few years before his death—"When, 50 years ago, my "brother Charles and I, in the simplicity of our hearts, told the good

“people of England, that unless they knew their sins forgiven they would be damned, I wonder they did not stone us. I hope the Methodists know better now; we preach assurance, as we ever did, as the privilege of believers, but we do not enforce it under pain of damnation.” Even Mr. Moore allows, that Mr. W. was not always uniform. But is not this waste of words to a committee of pious and intelligent gentlemen, whose preachers and society vary very materially in opinion on minor religious doctrines, if we may credit Mr. M’Afee? We are, as a society, extremely sorry that there has been one word on the subject of doctrines, as there was not a jaring string among us: and indeed, after all Mr. M’Afee has done, I am happy to say he has failed. Perhaps one or two individuals in Hull may in consequence return to the Conference Methodists, but among the trustees, there is not the slightest difference of opinion on the points at issue; and his attempts have only made us cleave closer to each other. Had we known the part he would have acted, we would have requested the Conference to have sent us some other preacher, or declined their co-operation.

But to return. You perhaps object that we cannot be about to establish *original* Methodism, because we do not purpose to establish band meetings. In this, however, you would be incorrect; as there were no band meetings at the first, and in the estimation of some of the preachers they were always doubtful meetings. I heard Mr. Charles Atmore say, he told Mr. Wesley to his face, that they had done more harm than good, and that he would never take a part in establishing them more: but Mr. Wesley did not on that account deem him unworthy to be a Methodist preacher. Hence it is clear that band meetings are not such an essential part of Methodist discipline, that they cannot be dispensed with. If Mr. Wesley had this view of class meetings, and considered them mere *prudential helps*, not *essential*, not of *divine institution*, he certainly would not claim a higher character for band meetings, which, in a great portion of the Methodist Societies, never had had an existence, and therefore cannot be necessary to the existence of genuine Methodism. There is not one clergyman, or dissenting minister, to whom we have explained the nature of band meetings, who approved of them; and I think, when you seriously and attentively consider the rules, as published by Mr. Wesley himself, you will feel some misgiving about them. Mr. Atkinson and I were both sorry to see our highly respected friend, Mr. Averill, so anxious to enforce the establishment of band meetings in your Connexion. The band rules, you will remember, are these:—To desire some person among us to speak his own experience first, then to ask the rest, in order, as many and as searching questions as may be, concerning their state, sins, and temptations; such as—1st. Have you been guilty of any known sin, since our last meeting? 2nd. What temptations have you met with? 3rd. How were you delivered? 4th. What have you thought, said, or done, of which you doubt whether it be a sin or not? I believe, that formerly, a superintendent preacher had power, on going into his circuit, to put from three to six persons in a band; men with men, and women with women, and appoint the leader to ask the questions as above. I imagine you

have attempted an improvement on this primitive practice, by allowing men and women to choose their own band mates; and that it appears, then, you do not object to adopt a different mode of meeting bands to Mr. Wesley, which may the better reconcile you to our taking the liberty of meeting some of our classes differently from the original mode. But even as you and the Conference Methodists meet bands now, I confess I cannot see the utility or propriety in them which some do. Now, my dear Sir, I put it to yourself; suppose you had a daughter, 14 or 16 years of age, who had become a member of your Society, would you suffer her to meet with two or three young females of similar age, to be exposed to hear such confessions as any of them might make, as to their temptations or evil thoughts; and besides be subject to be asked any questions which an idle or wanton curiosity might dictate? It may be answered, that where a disposition to improper conversation exists, opportunities will not be wanting to indulge it; but is it not creating an opportunity to appoint such a meeting, when under the sanction of religious confessions, disclosures might be made of a very improper nature? We had an instance of the kind in this neighbourhood, which, wherever it is known, will be a caution to females how they attend such meetings. I am perfectly aware, that in different ages of the Church confessions have been encouraged; but at the suggestion of Eudæmon, the office of the Penitentiary Presbyters was abolished, and every man was left at his own liberty as to confession; that precept of the Apostle being recommended, "Let a man examine *himself*, &c." St. Chrysostom, and the fathers of the more ancient Church, were opposed to confession. St. Chrysostom's words are (Hom. 31.) "I bid thee not to accuse thyself unto others, but to observe the prophet's direction; reveal thy ways unto the Lord, confess thy sins before God; dost thou confess them to thy fellow-servant, that he should bring thee upon the open stage? Thou only showest thy wounds to him who is thy Lord thy Creator." As members of the Church of England, I think it would be much safer and more consistent to follow our Reformers than St. Anthony: to say nothing of the better reason they give. Our learned and judicious Hooker observes—"The Church of England hath hitherto considered it the safer way to refer men's hidden crimes unto God and themselves only. To such as feel oppressed with any weighty matter, the way is opened in our own Church to the minister, who is liable to ecclesiastical censure if he disclose what is committed to him, unless they are crimes of a particular character. No necessity is imposed upon the people of opening their transgressions unto men, as if remission of sins otherwise was impossible."—[See *Hooker's Eccles. Polity*.] In some respects, I think that the confessions in a band meeting are more dangerous than popish confessions, and I observe many of the more intelligent preachers are very backward to encourage them.*

We have no wish to part with any thing in Methodism, which we think is not inconsistent with Christianity, and which is recommended by reason and experience. Band meetings, bibliomancy, and any other objectionable usages which early crept into the Methodist Societies, we

* See the subject of band meetings further considered, Appendix, No. VI.

would rather wave. Perhaps you have not adopted every part of Methodist discipline yourselves. Allow me to ask, have you established amongst you, Mr. Wesley's *monthly meeting*, which he so much valued? Have you his *weekly penitent meeting*? Do your Societies keep the *Friday fasts*? Do you keep up that particular meeting which Mr. Wesley made the test of Methodism, so much so, that he declares whenever it is given up the Methodists will be a fallen body of people—I mean the *five o'clock morning preaching*? I dare say in these particulars you will think with us, that Mr. Wesley was not infallible.

I would further observe, that there is a great fallacy in the argument I am considering, which forms the 3rd objection, “That Mr. Wesley's open and liberal system did not answer, as Mr. Whitfield and his friends left him; and *therefore* ours will not answer.”

You will at once perceive the deficiency of this argument. It should be first shewn that we are under the same circumstances, then there would be some weight in the objection. If we were even desirous of going as far as Mr. Wesley did, in allowing the very opposite doctrines to be preached from our pulpits, I believe it would not produce the effect it did then. We live in quite different times. The influence of our Bible and Missionary Societies* has already done wonders, in destroying a narrow bigoted feeling in the country. In the pulpits of the Establishment no bad effects arise from this union; nor do they in the Floating Chapels for Seamen, which are supplied by preachers of different denominations. We might as well argue against the system of Primitive Christianity, because Paul and Barnabas separated, or because a contention arose between St. Paul and St. Peter. But on our plan, where we wish no peculiarities to be insisted on, nor the pulpit made a theatre of dispute, and where the *essential* doctrines of Methodism are to be preached, and the government placed not in trustees and local officers, or the whole Society, (like the Independents) but in the Conference. Surely every thing is provided that can satisfy a reasonable mind, and which is all that was required by Mr. Wesley, Mr. Fletcher, and Mr. Hey. If you require us to draw up a set of articles for subscription, we should entirely object to it. 1. Because we are Churchmen, and ought not to make that formal separation which such a subscription would imply. As a Society we virtually subscribe the 39 Articles, which we deem sufficient; allowing for individual difference of opinion.—2. It is not *original* Methodism.—3. If any thing occur in our Connexion calling for alteration, consistent with our trust deeds, which will form a bar against Socinianism and Arianism,

* I might add to these, “*The Religious Tract Society*,” a branch of which has just been established here, supported both by Churchmen and Dissenters; and several of our own Clergy are amongst its best friends. Their liberality in this will appear, when the principles of the Society are considered, which are much the same as those of Church Methodism. In the last Annual Report the principles of the Society are avowed on the title-page in the following motto:—“Religious Tracts should consist of PURE TRUTH. By *pure truth*, when not expressed in the words of Scripture, the Committee refer to those evangelical principles of the Reformation, in which Luther, Calvin, and Cranmer were agreed. On this large portion of *common ground*, which the Churchman, the Dissenter, and the Foreigner jointly occupy, they conceive that *Christian union* may be established and strengthened; *Christian affection* excited and cherished, and *Christian zeal* concentrated, and rendered proportionably effective.”

and prevent our having services in canonical hours, or our giving the Sacraments, we can at any future Conference adopt measures suited to the circumstances of the case; and which was the principle upon which Mr. Wesley established Methodism. It is possible you may urge us not to return to *original* Methodism, but to Methodism as it existed at the time of Mr. Wesley's death, when it had received all the advantage which his long experience and acute and politic mind could give it. We candidly confess, we like the old wine best: we have tasted the new, it has set our teeth on edge. Our opinion, we are aware, will be little regarded: but what say some of your oldest friends in Dublin, who brought Mr. Wesley to tears in Friar-street Chapel Vestry? But what does Mr. Wesley say himself? Does he say, the discipline he finally established produced the effects and benefits he expected? He had put the important question to Conference, (which was answered by the preachers and himself in the affirmative)—“Does not our continually talking of a justified or sanctified state as such naturally tend to mislead our people, by leading them “to trust to what was done in a moment; whereas we are every moment “acceptable or unacceptable in the sight of God, according to our in- “temper and outward behaviour.” But in his sermon on the vineyard, he has expressed himself fully on the comparatively little good derived by his societies from the means he had established. “Might I not have expected “general increase of faith and love, of righteousness and true holiness; “yea, and of the fruits of the Spirit, love, joy, peace, long-suffering, “meekness, gentleness, fidelity, goodness, temperance? Was it not “reasonable to expect that these fruits would have overspread his “whole Church? Truly when I saw what God had done among his “people between 40 and 50 years ago, when I saw them warm in their “first love, magnifying the Lord and rejoicing in God their Saviour, “I could expect nothing less than that all these would have lived like “angels here below: that they would have walked as continually seeing “Him that is invisible, having constant communion with the Father and “the Son, living in eternity and walking in eternity. I looked to see “a “chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar “people,” in the whole tenor of their conversation, shewing forth His “praise; who had called them into His marvellous light. But instead “of this it brought forth wild grapes! fruits of quite a contrary nature. “It brought forth error in ten thousand shapes, turning many of the “simple out of the way! it brought forth enthusiasm, imaginary inspiration, ascribing to the all-wise God, all the wild, absurd, self-inconsistent dreams of a heated imagination! It brought forth pride, robbing “the Giver of every good gift of the honour due to his name! It “brought forth prejudice, evil-surmising, censoriousness, judging and “condemning one another: all totally subversive of that brotherly love, “which is the very badge of the Christian profession: without which “whosoever liveth is counted dead before God! It brought forth anger, “hatred, malice, revenge, and every evil word and work: all direful “fruits, not of the Holy Spirit, but of the bottomless pit! It brought “forth likewise in many, particularly those that are increased in goods, “that grand poison of souls, the love of the world; and that in all its “branches: “the desire of the flesh,” that is, the seeking happiness in

“the pleasures of sense : “the desire of the eyes,” that is seeking happiness in dress, or any of the pleasures of imagination : and “the pride of life,” that is, seeking happiness in the praise of men ; or in “that which ministers to all these, laying up treasures on earth. It brought forth self-indulgence of every kind, delicacy, effeminacy, softness : but not softness of the right kind, that melts at human woe. It brought such base grovelling affections, such deep earthly-mindedness, as that of the poor heathens, which occasioned the lamentation of their own poet over them, ‘*O curvæ in terras animæ et cœlestium inanes !*’ ‘O souls bowed down to earth, and void of God!’ ” *

Who, after this candid confession, would contend that the means of grace used among the Methodists will, on the whole, prove so beneficial to those who attend on them as to entitle them to the highest praise and confidence? I grant that class meetings, if *properly conducted*, may be of considerable service to many who attend them : but it is only candid to acknowledge, that with regard to others, there is great danger of their being excited to spiritual pride and solifidianism on the one hand, or of falling into a habit of hypocrisy on the other. Being obliged every week to speak of their experience, there is, I think, great danger lest (as they will naturally wish to appear as well as may be, before their fellow Christians) they should be tempted to slight deviations from strict truth, and thus a habit of dissimulation grow up with them, which will probably be carried into the affairs of common life. Much, it is true, depends upon the leader ; but when the character of many Methodist leaders is considered, (though there are also many of a very different description, men whose piety and intelligence would render them an ornament to any society) we need not wonder if some portion of the evils Mr. Wesley complains of, may be traced to this source. Even lovefeasts are not free always from this kind of evil, though much less so than classes. But when preachers injudiciously urge people to speak, telling them they will feel, in their own minds, condemned if they do not, there is great danger of professions being made, which are very little borne out by corresponding practice. I remember Mr. Watson observing once at Beverley, after a lovefeast, that generally those people were silent who ought to speak, and those spoke who had better say nothing ; and that he should recommend us to have lovefeasts only twice a year, instead of four times. Still, as, under proper management, these evils may be very much guarded against, and as none is compelled to speak, they seem worthy of support. An opportunity is afforded at them of speaking of the goodness of God, as displayed in behalf of any present ; and any one can offer such counsel and advice as he may deem needful.

I will now bring this long letter to a close, by a brief reference to what has passed between us. I need not again advert to our correspondence, to our original agreement with the preachers, or to what passed in the Conference and Committee. Two things showed, I think, how the matter stood. 1. Mr. M'Affee's account to Mr. Brigham, one of our

* Mr. Watson's observations on this passage, in his reply to Dr. Southey, are noticed in the Appendix, No. VII.

trustees, which perfectly agrees with what I have stated as passing in Conference; and, 2ndly, his having stated to me, in the hearing of Mr. Baker, one of our local preachers, that he considered he & Mr. McConkey came over to England to assist us, that they had nothing to do with the circular we published respecting our system, and that they were quite differently situated here in that respect, to what they were in Ireland. But supposing, after all, that we did not all rightly understand the ground upon which you were giving, and we receiving assistance—we know now, and it is for you to determine how the matter shall end. Our idea was, and is yet, that Mr. McAfee had no more right to attempt to sow dissention in our little Society, and even among the hearers, or to call on any of the clergy to try to dissatisfy them with our system, than we had a right to call on the clergy in Dublin to make our objections to your system. We never were, nor ever intended to be, any thing but what we are: we applied to you for assistance, and you kindly lent it us; but surely that could give the preachers no right to destroy what we had suffered so much in establishing. If, on maturely considering this exposé of our plan, you can continue your assistance for years to come, or exchange preachers with us, we beg we may wind matters up in the most kind and affectionate manner. Mr. A. Atkinson and I, who have had the great pleasure of seeing you and our friends in Dublin, will never, I trust, forget your kindness nor your excellent character; and if we are spared to second childhood, shall talk of Irish hospitality. Tho' you and we do not exactly agree as to what are the best means to be used for doing all the good we can, we cannot but be united by many ties. We are protestants and fellow-subjects; we are Methodists, who have suffered no little for our conscientious separation from the Dissenting Conference; and what is still more, we are members of that Militant Church, which we hope will be our passage to the Church Triumphant. We are, on the whole, moderate Arminians, and have no bias toward Calvinism, farther than that doctrine is, (in common with Arminianism and other *orthodox* doctrines) agreeable to the scriptures. There is one beautiful and powerful passage in Mr. Fletcher's works, so expressive of our feelings, that though I have written a much longer letter than I at first intended, I must transcribe it, in hopes that you will feel its influence, and that we shall be thus united by it more firmly than ever.

"Arise then, ye sons of peace, ye sons of God, into whose hands these sheets may fall. Our Captain is ready to lead you to the conquest of the kingdom of love. Be not discouraged at the smallness of your number, nor at the multitude of the men of war who are ready to oppose you. Jesus is on your side, he is our Gideon. With his mighty cross, he has smitten the altar of discord: pull it down, break your narrow pitchers of bigotry; hold forth your burning lamps; let the light of your love shine forth without a covering. Ye loving Calvinists, fall upon the necks of your Arminian opponents. And ye loving Arminians, be no more afraid to venture among your Calvinistic antagonists. You will not find them cruel Midianites, but loving Christians.—Methinks that your mingled lights have already chased away the shades of the night of partiality and ignorance. You see that you are Brethren; you feel it, and are ashamed of your former distance. You may think you can never make enough of each other, and testify too much

“your repentance for having offended the world by absurd contentions, and vexed each other by inimical controversies. The first love of the Christian revives: you are all of one heart, and of —, but I forget myself. I antedate the time of love, which I so ardently wish to see. The Jericho of bigotry, which I desire to compass, is strong. The Babylon of confusion and division, I would fain demolish, is guarded by a numerous garrison, which thousands of good men think it their duty to reinforce. It may not be improper, therefore, to make one more attack upon these accursed cities, and to ensure the success of it by proper directions.” Surely, after this, we shall not be suffered to quarrel about the difference between us and you; but agree to *disagree*, and separate in peace and keep up a friendly intercourse between the Connexions, rejoicing in each other’s prosperity.

We are anxious to see established what we consider to be *genuine old Methodism*, or that system of lay preaching in the Church of England, from which (especially in the present day) we have so much to hope, in assisting to spread genuine piety in the Church of England, as well as in checking the spread of Dissenting Methodism.—Next to the scriptures, we appeal to the writings of Mr. Wesley and of Mr. Fletcher, of whom we may say, with Dr. Southey, “No age or country has ever produced a man of more fervent piety, or more perfect charity; no Church has ever produced a more apostolic minister.” *

As it relates to Mr. M‘Afee; though we cannot but blame him for having taken the part he has, yet we know, “to err is human, to forgive divine,” and as we do not wish to cherish an unkind or unforgiving spirit, nor forget that we ourselves have much to be forgiven, we shall be very happy to be reconciled to him, and to unite with him in pursuing our object happily together, to awaken the careless and indifferent to a sense of religious truths, to encourage the penitent and fearful to receive into a believing heart the cordial truths of the Gospel—the death of Christ for their sins, and the assistance of the Holy Spirit to renew their fallen nature, that they may be made meet to be partakers of the kingdom of God. This might, at any rate, be done till Conference, and then one of the preachers might be withdrawn, and the other remain a few months longer. We have, I think, a prospect of being supplied by that time, or perhaps before. One of our principal clergymen (a man of the highest character and respectability) has kindly consented to give his occasional assistance in the education of a young man of piety and promising talents, who has exercised awhile as a local preacher amongst us, with great acceptance:—We have heard of other two preachers, but whether they would suit us or not, we do not yet know: one of them gives very respectable reference. Our prospect is at present flattering, and system well liked; and nothing, I believe, but perversely quarrelling among ourselves can (if even that can) prevent Church Methodism being very firmly established in Beverley and Hull. Let us do all we can to help one another, and promote the prosperity of both Connexions, and improve both, as we find circumstances open the way. We have the highest possible respect for

* See Southey’s *Life of Wesley*.

you, and those kind friends in Dublin, whom we had the pleasure of seeing at the Conference; and nothing intentional on our part shall dissolve the friendly relation existing between us; nor will we ever be engaged in any thing that can in the least oppose you, except in self-defence; and then, not till no alternative be left.* This, we trust and believe, will never be the case; but that every year will afford pleasing proofs of the increasing extension and stability of a plan, whose simple object is to unite all parties (however they may differ with respect to *non-essentials*) in the sacred bonds of Christian faith, and practical godliness.

I remain,

My dear Sir,

Yours, with sincere respect,

MARK ROBINSON.

* What return this offer has met with, may be seen by turning to article I. in the following Appendix.

POSTSCRIPTS.

There are two regulations agreed on by our friends since the foregoing letter was written, which, though different from yours, will, I hope, not displease you. We have no wish to be fanciful or desirous of searching after something new, but to 'enquire for the old paths.' Hence we have applied to the system of government we are anxious to adopt, those principles which we know have been long and successfully tried in the civil and ecclesiastical government of the country. After submitting these regulations, as we have also done the whole of the letter, to the examination of those clergymen whose characters stand very high in the country, we adopted them as promising much for our future Connexion, in giving the private members such a reasonable and scriptural power in each Society, as would naturally contribute to regulate the whole Connexion.

1. That the male members, *who are* of age, and who contribute to the finances of the Connexion, shall be eligible to vote in their own classes for one such member of each class to attend the quarterly meeting preceding Conference; to assist the travelling and local preachers, leaders and stewards, to elect some suitable representative to Conference.
2. Every member of Society, if accused of any breach of the rules, or if guilty of immorality, shall be subject to trial by a leaders' meeting, but shall have appeal to quarterly and district meetings; and such cases as are considered by the district meetings of sufficient importance, shall go to the Conference.

M. R.

As I was present during the different discussions at the meetings held in Beverley, referred to in this letter, as well as those held in Dublin, I add my testimony as to the truth of the statements here given: and I cordially approve of the principles of government sketched in this letter, and also of the whole letter.

ANTHONY ATKINSON.

We have carefully examined this letter, and fully approve of its contents.

HENRY CALDER
THOMAS BAKER
WILLIAM HARRISON
WILLIAM HEWSON

WILLIAM CROSSKILL
JOHN SHEPHERD
THOMAS BRIGHAM
W. G. STATHER.

This list, including Mr. Atkinson and the writer, contains all the trustees of the Beverley chapel.

APPENDIX.



ARTICLE I.

It will be seen, by reference to the date, that the foregoing letter was addressd to Mr. Curry, on the 9th of January, 1826 ; but tho' it was read by him to the Managing Committee, we waited week after week, yet received no reply. Our chapel was soon after finished, but the preachers would not open it, unless we would come to terms which must eventually have made us subject to their system and economy, and dependent upon them for supplies. Mr. M'Afee and Mr. M'Conkey saw the strait we were in, and imagined we should be compelled to submit. We had held meeting after meeting, and though the trustees of the chapel heard every thing the preachers had to advance on Mr. Atkinson's and my supposed departure from the agreement we entered into with the Irish Conference, they were fully satisfied, on hearing our reply, that we had acted rightly; and one of the most active trustees, Mr. John Shepherd, told them, that if we had gone to Conference, and entered into the kind of agreement they represented, he would have had no more to do with the Connexion. The trustees were, on this subject, unanimous to a man; and Mr. M'Afee one day confessed that it certainly was his intention, in coming over here after the Conference, to establish the Irish system; that he thought he could have got a majority of the trustees on his side, but that he was mortified to find himself defeated, as all the trustees, without *one* exception, were of one heart and one mind. At this critical juncture, we received a letter from Mr. Hillaby, our English preacher in Cork, that a Mr. George Montgomery West had just returned to that city from Canada. He had been highly spoken of as a popular preacher, by Mr. M'Afee, and understanding he had left the Primitive Wesleyan Methodists of Ireland, amongst whom he had been a preacher many years, we wrote to him to know if he were at liberty, and approved of our plan of proceedings, &c. not wishing to engage any preacher who did not; but he only returned us an evasive mysterious answer. Although we gave him no invitation to come to England, either directly or indirectly, he wrote us to say, that he would come over. We immediately wrote him, requesting he would not come; yet, though he acknowledged he received our letter, he came over in the very face of our request that he would not. After he had come, and many people became anxious to hear him, the trustees, after some deliberation, consented that, on certain conditions, he should open the chapel, which he did, and addressed an overflowing congregation. They soon found, however, that they had been too unsuspicious, as it appeared very clear, from his subsequent conduct, that his principal object in coming to Beverley, was to make his peace with the Irish Connexion (with whom, at the time, he was in disgrace) by betraying our cause into their hands. In proof of this, we found that while he was speaking to us of the leading people in the Irish Connexion, in the most violent terms, he was

going to Mr. M'Afee and Mr. M'Conkey *privately*, and telling them that if they would listen to him, he could get the chapel and the whole concern into the hands of the Irish. That he did do so, we had the assurance of Mr. M'Afee and Mr. M'Conkey; and, in fact, Mr. Atkinson and I were present, when we heard them make the charge in Mr. West's presence. On the other hand, he was continually urging us to dissolve all connexion with those preachers, and constantly declared, after hearing all that could be said by both parties, that we were in the right. The preachers again warned us to have nothing to do with Mr. West, since we should bitterly repent it if we did. Their conduct had, however, made us distrustful of them, and unhappily we did not take the warning, but engaged with him, and then had the mortification, from day to day, to witness his continued attempts to possess himself of our chapels, or contrive to dissolve the Society; and though, as it relates to Beverley, he failed in both attempts, he was but too successful in Hull. Having borrowed three hundred pounds, he succeeded in purchasing the chapel there, for which the Beverley trustees were treating at the time. He professed that though he went over to Hull without the knowledge of the Beverley trustees, he was in reality buying it for them, lest Mr. M'Conkey, Mr. Smelt, and Mr. Bell Robinson should secure it for the Irish Connexion. After he had got the chapel conveyed to himself, he gave us his most solemn assurance, that he had purchased it for our cause, and excused himself for having done it *privately*, for the reason just stated, lest the Irish should get it. After consulting the parties who had lent him the money, he promised to deliver the chapel up to us, on our paying £100. at the time of taking possession, and £200. when the amount could be collected. But when the time came, and we offered to pay him the £100. he refused to give up the chapel, † except on condition of having a certain salary allowed him out of it, and being paid £50. extra, with several particulars, with which he knew we should not, and indeed could not according to our published constitution, agree. Of Mr. West I may now take my leave; only remarking, that had we been less ready to believe the religious professions and solemn protestations he made, we should have avoided much loss and inconvenience. The trustees, however, at last became so disgusted with his proceedings, that they called on him to name the persons on his part, and they would name those on their part, before whom they wished the whole affair to be brought. * He refused, however, to have it investigated at all; and on the trustees holding a meeting, at which only one trustee was absent, they unanimously agreed to dismiss him, and wrote him † to that effect, he almost immediately left the town; and we were in hopes we should be annoyed by him no more.

After the Irish Conference (at which, however, he was not admitted as a preacher) he returned to Beverley, and attempted, with Mr. Ford and Mr. M'Conkey, to take forcible possession of the dwelling-house adjoining the chapel. He was probably emboldened to take this step,

† See this Appendix, Article VIII.

* It must be remembered, that Mr. West had agreed, on his engaging with the trustees, to put any differences which might arise to reference. See Article IX.

† See Article X.

in consequence of having some time before prevailed, by a system of specious offers, with a considerable majority of the trustees, to treat with him for the chapel. For my own part, firmly believing that Mr. West never intended to complete the bargain, but only to distract the attention of the trustees, and ultimately to effect a separation amongst them, and also because I conceived it would on many accounts be ineligible, I objected to treat with him; yet, that I might not oppose the supposed interests of the other trustees, or be too confident in my own judgment, I offered to put the business to reference, and engaged that if the referees, who should be mutually chosen, were of opinion that I ought to concur in the sale of the chapel to Mr. West, I would give my consent. But the trustees, being wearied out with his vacillating conduct, had dismissed him, as before stated; and this new attempt, on the part of himself and his Irish friends, proved vain, and he at last finally left the country.

In obtaining the Hull chapel he was more successful, and it is understood he has transferred it to the Irish Connexion, although he was constantly declaring, that his object in buying it in the *private* way he did, was in order to keep it out of the hands of the very people he has sold it to! Indeed, at the time Mr. West secured the Hull chapel, the friends of Mr. McConkey were so anxious to secure it, that the owner of the chapel assured us that one gentleman from Beverley actually offered to pay a thousand guineas immediately, if he would break his agreement with Mr. West, who had purchased it, as was supposed, for the Church Methodist Connexion at Hull and Beverley.* A letter was some months ago addressed to Mr. West by some of the trustees, containing a very particular review of the whole of his proceedings, the circumstances attending his procuring of the £300. &c. which, should it become necessary, will be given to the public; but I shall content myself with this brief account at present, only noticing one transaction more respecting him, and then return to some account of Mr. McAfee and Mr. McConkey.

After Mr. West had preached the sermon at the opening of the Hull chapel, he met myself, Mr. W. H. Dikes, and several others in the vestry, and endeavoured to convince us that we were obliged to him for having procured the chapel for us, and for the care he had taken in keeping it out of the hands of Mr. McConkey, Mr. Bell Robinson, and Mr. Smelt; and delivered the collection up to one of the gentlemen present—of course, then, this collection was no more

* "*Hull, 6th April, 1826.*

"This is to certify, that the Church Methodists of Beverley purchased a chapel of me, on Monday, the 27th of April, 1826, before one o'clock in the afternoon, that being the time to which I had engaged to keep the chapel for them. Some gentlemen, on the part of the Irish Methodists, had applied for it, and I informed them, that if it was not purchased by one o'clock on Monday, they should have the offer of it again; for it may be remarked, that Mr. McConkey had applied for the chapel in the beginning of March, and I gave him till the 20th, that he might receive directions from the party in Ireland: on the 20th he sent me a letter, in which he said the Irish Connexion had so many places to attend to, that they declined to purchase. I offered the Church Methodists the chapel the following day, and before their time expired, they purchased it. After the Church Methodists had purchased the chapel, a gentleman from Beverley, on behalf of the Irish Methodists, when he found the Church Methodists had purchased, offered to pay a thousand guineas down, if I would recind the bargain.

WILLIAM TINKLER."

intended for the Irish Methodists, than for the Moravians or Roman Catholics. But before the chapel was opened, he was extremely anxious to have it repaired and painted, which we, along with himself, employed workmen to do, not then supposing that he would so deceive us as not to give the chapel up, when we had his written agreement to do so; and now that those workmen present their bills for payment, the parties into whose hands Mr. West gave up the chapel, (though they are enjoying all the benefit of the work,) refuse to pay any part of it.—They know we have made ourselves legally responsible; and, Mr. West having left the country, they excuse themselves for two reasons—1. Because we have got the small collections made by Mr. West, at the opening of the chapel. 2. Because we obtained several subscriptions in Hull. To which I answer, that it is very clear, from Mr. West's own account, who the parties were, for whom he made the collection: it could not be for those whom he professed such a desire to oppose. † —As to the subscriptions, a particular explanation was given in almost every instance where we called for a subscription, of the nature of our system, and in what particulars it differed from the Irish one. Indeed, I know that several persons who subscribed to Church Methodism, would not have given a farthing to promote Primitive Wesleyan Irish Methodism. It is fortunate for us, that the repairs and painting of the chapel do not amount to a large sum of money; but this detail shews what notions some of our townsmen and their Irish friends have of justice.

But to return to Mr. M'Afee and Mr. M'Conkey, at the time of Mr. West's arrival. Relying on the correctness of certain documents, which Mr. West exhibited as to his own character, and being assured by him that he felt a great interest in our undertaking; and, moreover, being a man of popular talents as a preacher, we were led to place an unhappy and ill-founded confidence in him; and as Mr. M'Afee, and especially Mr. M'Conkey, persisted in their determination to discontinue their labours, unless we would come to their terms, we agreed with them, that they should return to Ireland. This was in Feb. and Mr. M'Afee was engaged to us till June; (the time of the Irish Conference) but Mr. M'Conkey was to return when our chapel was opened, and another Irish preacher sent in his place.* When we proceeded to settle with them, they told us that they should expect their full stipend paying up to the Conference, and also full allowance for board; but that on reaching Ireland, and proceeding to any circuits they might be sent to by the Dublin Managing Committee, they would hold the allowance which they received for their labours in trust for us, as they acknowledged it

† See Article XI.

* "*Resolved by the Conference of Dublin*,—That Mr. M'Afee and Mr. M'Conkey be appointed for Beverley; and that on their way they call, or one of them, at Liverpool, and if an opening offer, Mr. M'Fan be removed from Dublin to Liverpool, till the Beverley chapel be opened, when Mr. M'Fan shall proceed to Beverley, open the chapel, and continue there; and Mr. M'Conkey shall proceed to his place in Liverpool: but in case Liverpool should not open, then Mr. M'Fan proceed immediately from Ireland to Beverley, and Mr. M'Conkey take his place in Youghal.

(Signed)

"8th July, 1825.

"ADAM AVERELL, President."

would be unfair to be paid twice. This we agreed to, and Mr. M'Conkey forwarded his books and most of his clothes to Ireland, and Mr. M'Afee prepared also for his departure. Mr. Atkinson and I called at the preachers' house, to pay Mr. M'Afee and Mr. M'Conkey, and to take our leave of them. Mr. M'Afee gave us a written memorandum of our agreement; * but when we turned to Mr. M'Conkey, he hesitated, and said we might take his word, and at last said he would write nothing. On our asking him very particularly if he would pay to us what he received in Ireland for preaching, from the time of his reaching his circuit to the meeting of Conference; he replied that he would, except what he might receive for travelling expenses: we said we had no objection to that. I then took my leave of both him and Mr. M'Afee, and wished them a safe voyage. About an hour after Mr. Atkinson called on me, in great haste, to say, that after Mr. M'Conkey had got the money he refused to go; and tho' he had once made a hasty offer to return the money, (which Mr. Atkinson declined receiving, in the hopes that he would re-consider the subject, and act uprightly) yet he now refused either to go or to return the money.—

* In order to correct a report, that Mr. Atkinson or I had behaved very ill to Mr. M'Afee, in having so settled the account with him as to defraud him of £8. 8s. *I here give Mr. M'Afee's own statement*, which, I hope, will be deemed satisfactory. But to put the matter beyond all doubt, I will give Mr. A. Atkinson's account of the transaction. Although the parties have promised to endeavour to undo the evil they have done, in circulating the report against us, yet we fear that their endeavour will prove inadequate to the removal of the mischief done, as no doubt the false report will spread much more rapidly than its antidote.

"On eagles' wings immortal scandals fly,

"While virtuous actions are but born and die."

Many persons, both in England and Ireland, who have heard of the report, but know nothing of its being now contradicted by those who propagated it, will naturally expect to see it accounted for in this publication; and in default of that, would suppose that we were unable to give a satisfactory explanation of it:—

"—— Mr. M'Afee engaged to serve us as a preacher here, not to establish the Irish system of Methodism, but Church Methodism, such as Mr. Wesley first had it, provided we paid him £100. a-year, though he had only about £80. in Dublin. Before he left Beverley, he informed me that the £100. was not enough, that he had been obliged to take money, which was not his own, to meet his expenses, and begged I would repay him the money he had expended; I asked him how much it

"was he had brought with him from Dublin, he said	£5	0	0
"Had taken from the Dublin book-money	12	16	0
"Had received from —— and ——	8	8	0
"And had borrowed of Mr. ——, Leeds	2	0	0
	28	4	0

"This £28. 4s. he said he had expended over and above his allowance of £100. a-year, except what he had paid for books, and a pair of globes, which he had by him	8	8	0
"And therefore only asked for the sum which he said he was really deficient	19	16	0

"Now when asked to make up this deficiency, I might have refused, urging that £100 a-year was our agreement, and was more than the Irish Conference would have allowed him, if they had sent him here to establish their system; and he having expended his income, was no business of mine. Had I done this, it might have been

I immediately went with Mr. Atkinson to Mr. M'Afee's, but Mr. M'Conkey had left the house. Mr. and Mrs. M'Afee both expressed their disapprobation of his proceedings: Mr. Atkinson and I accompanied Mr. M'Afee part of the way to Hull, and talked the matter very fully over; he said he would advise us not to take the least notice of Mr. M'Conkey, as he would represent his (Mr. M'Conkey's) conduct to the Dublin Committee, and he was sure they would order him home. Indeed, Mr. M'Afee reprobated his conduct as very dishonourable, and spoke sharply to him respecting it. He then offered to give the money up, if the Committee ordered him. This, however, we regarded as a kind of subterfuge, since he knew, that without any such offer on his part, he would be obliged to give it up if the Committee directed him to do so. In spite, however, of every remonstrance, Mr. M'Conkey kept our money, and then commenced regular preaching at the same hours as ourselves, that he might thereby divide the Society and Congregation, while Mr. M'Afee returned with his family to Dublin. From that time to this we have not had one penny returned to us; and are now given to understand, in spite of Mr. M'Conkey's verbal promise, and Mr.

"said that Mr. M'Afee had expended, on our account, the money given him for his own private use, though that could have hardly been urged, since the money was given him to pay for the education of his daughters, and he applied most of it to that use. "But instead of making any objection, or even paining his feelings for a moment, by enquiring into the particulars of his expenditure, I generously paid him every penny of the deficiency, and solemnly declare that I never received a farthing from him after. Mr. M'Afee has left us a written declaration that we paid him 'handsomely.' "—I paid him the £8. 8s. over again, as included in the £19. 16s. but never had one farthing returned. In addition to this, I paid him £64. which included his salary up to Conference, as well as his travelling expenses; and though we have his written promise to return whatever he received from the Irish for preaching during the time, we have yet received nothing." I here subjoin Mr. M'Afee's own statement:—

"I hereby acknowledge, that I have received from Mr. A. Atkinson, on account of the trustees of the Church Methodist Chapel, in Beverley, the sum of £62. 16s. which pays me up to the Conference. This sum is paid to me by the trustees, that I may run no risk of losing any part of my regular salary, by removing from England to Ireland; and therefore, they have paid me up in full, and also the expenses of my journey to Dublin, amounting to £21. making, in all, £83. 16s. I here most distinctly state, this money, in whole or part, is not paid as a compromise for real or supposed breach of any agreement between the trustees, or any of them, and myself and the committee, but is paid in order that I may not, on leaving England, be left without assistance, or obliged to ask it. As, however, the trustees have handsomely paid me up to the Conference, in June next, I consider, that should there be an opening for me to preach on my return, the Society for which I preach, is bound in honour to pay me the regular allowance; and that allowance, whatever it be, is due to the Beverley Society; and I hereby promise to pay it over to them. I will do the very best in my power to prevail with the Irish Conference to allow the £21. paid on account of the travelling expenses as the Beverley Society has been at great expense.

"DANIEL M'AFEE."

If Mr. M'Afee has made any such insinuations, as those I have detailed, in Ireland, I hope this will effectually meet them. As to Mr. M'Conkey, one of our friends told me the other day that Mr. Smelt had attempted to justify him, on the ground that he had never said (in so many words) that he would return to Ireland. All such excuses only make the matter worse, since it is clear, from all he did, that if even he had been cunning enough to avoid using the words, "I will return to Ireland," he would have gained nothing by it, and only shewn that he possessed that discreditable quality, which is the proper characteristic of a race below us in the scale of being. When asked to sign along with

M'Afee's written one, that the Irish Connexion will not pay us any thing, nor will Mr. M'Afee and Mr. M'Conkey.

On the whole of these extraordinary proceedings, there seems a necessity for making a few general remarks. It will at once be evident to every impartial reader, that, as a Society, we have been grossly imposed upon by those whose assistance we sought, for the purpose of establishing a religious connexion, united by the same general views and feelings, but materially differing as to the system of government by which their affairs are regulated. It is very difficult to account for this, considering that many of those who form the Dublin Managing Committee are respectable and (we believe) pious men; who, in any private business of their own, would shrink from such a transaction as the one before us. It is almost incredible what some men will do in support of a party, especially where their passions are strongly excited by an unconquerable attachment to religious peculiarities: on what other principle can we account for the injustice, violence, and even the most cruel persecutions which one body of Christians has been guilty of toward another. Witness those of the Romish Church towards the Protestants—of the Protestants towards the Puritans—and of the Puritans again,

Mr. M'Afee, he refused; and why? because he said we might take his word. What to do? To repay the money he received for preaching in Ireland! Was not this a *virtual* engagement to go? Why did he send his clothes and books to Ireland, scarcely leaving himself (in the opinion of Mrs. M'Afee) sufficient clothes to serve him here even for a short time. Why did Mr. M'Afee, his own friend and superintendent, acknowledge to Mr. Atkinson and myself, that he had acted very dishonourably; so much so, that he was sure the Dublin Managing Committee would re-call him? Nay, he even went so far as to advise us to take no notice of him. Even suppose (which I do not believe to be the fact) that he never used the words, "I will return to Ireland," or promised to do so in so many words: is it not very evident, that if he did not intend going to Ireland, he was grossly deceiving us all the while; and that it cannot be creditable either to Mr. Smelt, nor any one else, to attempt to exculpate him on such ground. I may here remark on Mr. M'Afee's and Mr. M'Conkey's strange inconsistency. In this affair of ours, they were such strict disciplinarians, that they could not allow any deviation from the Irish system; now Mr. M'Conkey and Mr. Ford, (I take it for granted, with the consent of Mr. Bell Robinson and Mr. Smelt) have opened the chapel in Osborne-street (which Mr. West got from us to betray into their hands) at half-past ten and half-past two, *the regular English canonical hours*. The chapel is within a stone-throw of the new church, supplied, at the very same hours, by one of the most pious and eminent ministers in England, the Rev. Thomas Dikes. There is, besides, service in the parish church at the same hours. This, we suppose can have never had the consent of the Connexion in Ireland, but must be the beginning of a new Connexion approaching to Irish Independent Methodism. Mr. M'Afee, we are informed, has returned to the Dissenting Conference Methodists in Ireland, having entirely left the Primitive Wesleyan Methodists. We may, indeed, say with the Psalmist, '*Lord, what is man?*' When Mr. M'Afee was in England, it was with great difficulty he was restrained from publishing a pamphlet against the very Connexion which we are informed he has now re-joined. The greatest fault he found with me was, that I had been too mild and lenient with Mr. Galland and the other Methodist preachers. Indeed, I had some trouble to prevent him from calling on Mr. Galland, for the express purpose of originating a controversy with him; but I at last prevailed with him to desist. Few men have more precipitancy of character than Mr. M'Afee; which, whatever credit may be given him for the goodness of his intention at the time, (and this I do not for a moment call in question) is apt, on many occasions, to lead him to adopt the most hasty and injudicious measures. In proof of this, I might refer to facts named in a letter, written to him before he left Beverley, by the trustees of the chapel, but I shall for the present wave it. I may say the same respecting a long article, in my possession, written by him on the system of Dissenting Conference Methodism, which he condemns in very strong terms, and which also contains remarks on Mr. Bunting and the Conference.

in New England, toward the Quakers. * Indeed, our Saviour himself assured his disciples, that the time would come when they that put them to death, would think that they thereby did God service. In looking at the instances of persecution to which I refer, it would be too much to say, that there were no pious well meaning and even intelligent individuals who were concerned in them, whether we point to Catholics or Protestants; but at the same time every Christian must, in his own unbiassed judgment, abhor the spirit and party prejudice which gave rise to it. The same must be felt in the instance before us. To see a number of men engage to lend their assistance to others, who have conscientiously left the same Connexion they have done, and under very similar circumstances, eventually deserting them, because they will not become subject to every *non-essential* regulation which they may dictate—deserting them too at the very moment when they most needed their assistance, and even threaten to put them to great expenses—to enter into an engagement quietly to return to the country they came from—and then (as to one of them at least) refusing to go when they had possessed themselves of the money of the other party; and tho' they promised to repay part of the money (if they receive any on returning to their country)—now refuse to pay any thing: nay even refuse to pay for the repairs and painting of a chapel which had been most dishonourably obtained by them from the other party. These are things which, tho' not in *magnitude*, yet in *principle*, may be ranked with the most cruel persecutions; and had the parties lived in the times above referred to, and possessed the civil power, what security have we that those who have now deserted us in our difficulties, and threatened to involve us in heavy expenses, if we would not submit to their terms, would not they have *compelled* us to obedience by *more effectual means*? The amount of loss to which the trustees, under the most disadvantageous circumstances, may be subjected, is a trifle, compared to the loss which others in former times have had to suffer; and it is matter of sincere rejoicing, that the mild, free, and excellent Government under which the Providence of God has placed us, secures us against those injuries and persecutions which the less tolerant principles of even some voluntary religious associations would subject us.

* Who can contemplate, without feelings of unmixed disgust and horror, the following law:—"For now a law was made, which furnished continual work to the persecutors there. The contents whereof were, that whosoever of the inhabitants should directly or indirectly cause any of the Quakers to come into that jurisdiction, he should forfeit an hundred pounds to the country, and be committed to prison, there to remain till the penalty should be satisfied. And whosoever should entertain them, knowing them to be so, should forfeit forty shillings to the country for every hour's entertaining or concealment: and be committed to prison till the forfeiture should be fully paid and satisfied. And farther, that all and every of those people that should arise among them there, should be dealt withal, and suffer the like punishment as the laws provided for those that came in, viz. *That for the first offence, if a male, one of his ears should be cut off, and be kept at work in the house of correction, till he be sent away on his own charge. For the second, the other ear, and be kept in the house of correction, as aforesaid. If a woman, then to be severely whipt, and kept as aforesaid, as the male for the first; and for the second offence, to be dealt withal as the first. And for the third, he or she should have their tongues bored through with an hot iron, and be kept in the house of correction, close at work, till they be sent away on their own charge.*"

[Sewel's History of the Quakers, vol. i. p. 328.]

It must often occur to an impartial historian, that a true history of any event cannot be expected, where a very minute knowledge is not obtained of all the parties, their private views and engagements. So in the present instance. I firmly believe, had it not been for a private acquaintance made by Mr. M'Conkey, that we should have been spared much of the inconvenience we have had to suffer. I well remember two things in confirmation of this: in a conversation one day with Mr. M'Afee, he said, our system was very beautiful in theory, if it could only be made to work, and he believed many of their friends in Ireland would prefer it to their own; and if we could succeed here, he should not mind if he never returned to Ireland; and in conclusion said, "Now do talk to Mr. M'Conkey in the same way you have talked to me." I said, "I have much less hope of him, than I have of you."—He replied, "I do'nt know; I should like you to talk to him." I know Mr. M'Afee said to a gentleman in the town, that if matters could be agreed on, he should not care if he did not return to Ireland. I talked to Mr. M'Conkey, but in vain. Another thing which surprised me, was this—one evening Mr. Smelt, Mr. Bell Robinson, and I accidentally met at Mr. M'Afee's, when the subject became matter of conversation for several hours—Mr. Smelt objected particularly to the subscription to Mr. Wesley's works, required by Mr. M'Afee, on the ground especially of Mr. Wesley's views of Christian perfection; and contended, that Mr. Wesley was by no means consistent with himself: but stated, that what appeared to him the most glorious doctrine, was (that advocated by Mr. Winchester) *universal restoration*. Mr. Bell Robinson not having paid much attention to the subject, remained silent. Mr. M'Afee and I agreed to maintain a friendly difference of opinion on the points at issue between us, as already described—and he, Mr. Smelt, Mr. Bell Robinson, and I parted on the most friendly terms. As Mr. Smelt and I returned from the house, he expressed great pleasure at the interview, and said as we and the Irish preachers did not see alike, they had best be withdrawn. I acquiesced and said, that as Mr. M'Afee was the superintendent and had a family, he had better remain till Conference, and Mr. M'Conkey might return, and Mr. Baker take his place. But to my surprise, Mr. Smelt proposed that Mr. M'Conkey should stay and Mr. M'Afee return, launching out in uncommon praise of Mr. M'Conkey's preaching talents. I said, I thought his preaching was pretty well, but not at all extraordinary; and that it would never do to employ two such young men, and send Mr. M'Afee away. I little then knew of any thing more than a common acquaintance between Mr. M'Conkey and Mr. Smelt, though I could not account for Mr. Smelt's strange proposal, since he had always appeared so much attached to Mr. M'Afee; and it is possible, that Mr. Smelt might not be influenced by any considerations, but those arising out of his admiration of Mr. M'Conkey's piety and talents.

It is, however, surprising what arguments some people will use, when it suits their inclination. In the course of our discussion at Mr. M'Afee's that evening, he and Mr. Smelt urged it upon me as a weighty consideration, that as I and my friends had been engaged in a controversy with the Dissenting Conference Methodists, the public would think it very strange to see us engaged in another controversy

with the Irish Methodists, and that on that account public opinion must be against us! * To attempt a grave reply to such an objection, and coming from such a quarter, I considered absurd; and therefore contented myself with simply remarking, that truth being the object of my enquiries and proceedings, I would lose sight of that: yet I could not but marvel at Mr. M'Afee making such an objection, as he had separated from, and written against, the Dissenting Methodists himself; and still more that Mr. Smelt should join him, when he had made so many changes in his religious profession. I am aware that this is an argument which cuts both ways. It may be urged, that Mr. Smelt, knowing from experience, how unwilling the different parties he had left were to do him justice in his successive changes, he was apprehensive lest justice should be denied to us. I admit the force of the reply, and am ready to acknowledge that few men have seen more of religious society than Mr. Smelt. As the Irish preachers, who are at present receiving his warm support, have opened the chapel in Osborne-street, in canonical hours (half-past ten and half-past two, as I have already noticed in the note page 39) one would suppose there is somewhere a want of attachment to the Church; and that in fact, a separation from the Irish Connexion is contemplated or effected, as it is entirely at variance with the Irish "*Book of Principles*," sold here by Mr. M'Conkey.

I may here call the attention of the reader to what formed the basis of our agreement with the Irish Conference, and which Mr. M'Afee and Mr. Mallin named on their coming over here, as all to which the Managing Committee in Dublin required our conformity: — "1. That we should hold no meetings in canonical hours, when

* After such a hint as this, and especially after the observations which I know one of the Irish preachers made on the subject of our separation from the Dissenting Methodist Connexion, it seems but an act of common caution to give some account of that affair, in order that any uninformed reader may be on his guard against any statements which, either through ignorance or prejudice, may be made against us, especially in Ireland. To persons who know that the Irish Connexion was so well pleased with my "*Observations on Methodism*," and the review of it, in the *Christian Guardian*, that they published the whole of the review in their magazine; and that Mr. M'Afee wrote and sent to Ireland while he was here, an article for the magazine, (whether it was inserted or not) in which he was pleased to eulogize both the pamphlet and myself, will think there is no great occasion for caution on my part; but hundreds, even of Primitive Wesleyan Methodist Society in Ireland, probably know very little about the matter, and receive the impression the preachers give in such cases as truth.

By reference to the preface, it will be seen on what grounds myself and friends separated from the Dissenting Conference, and it only remains to give a very brief history of what followed, as those who wished for a more particular account, are referred to the pamphlets named in article II. in this Appendix.

In consequence of writing my "*Observations on Methodism*," which, by the way I may remark, would not have been published, had the Methodist preachers allowed them to have been read in a quarterly meeting, as I conceive they ought to have done, especially under all the circumstances of the case, which need not now be repeated, as they are before the public, in the pamphlets referred to, † one meeting after another was held in order to expel me from the Society, for writing this pamphlet, and yet the reader will not suppose it was so very bad, that nothing less than expulsion from a Christian community could satisfy for the offence, when he knows what opinion

† See Introduction to "*Robinson's Observations on Methodism*," 2d ed. p. 1. and also this Appendix, Article II.

"there is service in the Church. 2. That we should not administer the Sacraments. 3. That we should have a representative system."

Now, Mr. M'Conkey and Mr. Ford are, to all intents and purposes, violating the 1st article, by holding meetings in canonical hours, as before stated.

As Mr. Smelt has made very free in remarking on myself and Mr. Atkinson, in terms of unmerited reproach, such as I trust I shall not be compelled to repeat, and which has in part induced us to appear on this occasion before the public, I hope he will not feel offended at a remark I am about to offer for his consideration, which is, that if he should again leave the Church of England, by uniting with the two Irish preachers, who have begun to have service at half-past ten and half-past two in Hull, it may be worth his while to consider whether he would not, by such a step, become a Dissenter *substantially* at least. Such, most assuredly, the Primitive Wesleyan Methodists of Ireland would consider him; as it is regarded by them as one leading proof of the Conference Methodists being Dissenters. It is also certainly rather singular to witness Mr. Smelt so lately signing his name to a letter approving of there being no doctrinal test insisted on, but an agreement in the *essentials* of Christianity in Church Methodism, now joining Mr. M'Conkey in attempting to ridicule it.—(See the note, page 22 of the foregoing Letter.)

Far be it from me to condemn Mr. Smelt, for the successive changes he has made in his religious profession, because I take it for granted that they were all made on principle; and I should not have even adverted to them, had he not rendered it in some degree necessary, by arguing against me, as though I had followed his example. I was educated in

was formed of its contents by disinterested and competent judges. These respectable testimonies in its favour would not, however, have been given here (as they are before the public) had not this publication been designed for the information of those in Ireland, who may wish to know the whole truth of this affair, as well as for those of our neighbours, who are desirous of possessing a correct account. The *Christian Guardian* for July, 1824, remarks:—"This investigation appears to be fair, calm, and temperate; and the conclusion perfectly legitimate and *incontrovertible*. The whole of this enquiry appears to be conducted in a very christian spirit; and if noticed by any advocates for the present system of Methodism, we trust the same calmness of temper, the same modesty of expression, and the same piety of sentiment will be evinced. *Controversy conducted in such a way cannot but be productive of good.* Truth will be elicited; Christian peace will be undisturbed; charity will obtain fresh opportunities of exercise; and that collision, which would have ground inferior combatants to powder, will only serve to rub off all the asperities of truly spiritual minds, and make them shine with the brilliancy of diamonds of the first water."

As it has been insinuated that this is a flattering character of the "*Observations*," I have taken the liberty of adding the testimony of one whose opinion will not, I think, be called in question; Dr. Southey, the Poet Laureate:—"Your pamphlet deserves the character given of it in the *Christian Guardian* for July."

"ROBERT SOUTHEY, *Keswick*."

It is observed in the *Guardian*, for September, 1825:—"The integrity of Mr. Robinson's character, and the correctness of his reasonings, are clearly demonstrated by the ineffectual exertions of his adversaries to refute him. We, therefore, take our leave of the controversy, with the full conviction, that Mr. Robinson is well able to defend himself without our assistance."—So again, in the same work for November, 1825, it is said, "Mr. Robinson's '*Observations*' can never be silenced by such inconclusive reasoners as Messrs. Welch and Sandwith."

† See *Methodist Magazine* for 1821, p. 123, and this *Appendix*, Art. XII.

the very principles I now advocate, my father being strictly a Church Methodist, ‡ who steadily opposed the introduction of the sacrament and service in canonical hours, when there was service in the Church in the parish (Lockington,) in which he lived. I was very young when I joined the Methodist Society in Beverley, which was before either the sacrament or morning service was introduced. The sacrament was introduced before I was a member of the leaders' or quarterly meeting, and had therefore no opportunity either of hearing the subject formally debated, or of voting upon it; though if I had, at that time, it is probable I should have voted for it, as I was totally ignorant of the merits of the question, and had heard the measure greatly praised by those to whom I naturally then looked up as my religious instructors. But, more than ten years ago, as my correspondence with the late Mr. Edward Hare will shew, (and that was as soon as I began seriously to consider the subject,) I greatly doubted the propriety and consistency in the Methodists of separating from the Church. As to the morning service, it was introduced of late years, and both myself and Mr. Atkinson, as well as several other of the leaders and local preachers opposed it.

Some of our friends, in consequence of the treatment we have met with from the Irish preachers, have felt disposed to denounce the Irish character as being universally rash and deceitful. This, I think, is unjust † We must not forget our Ushers, Wellingtons, &c. and as one of the Irish preachers justly observed, we had been mainly betrayed by our own friends. Here I am strongly tempted to advert to, and give the whole history of, the £300. &c. &c. as illustrative of this remark; but at present I forbear.

Should subsequent efforts to establish Church Methodism on a

The *Christian Remembrancer*, for Feb. 1825, observes:—"Mr. Mark Robinson is a true Wesleyan—a Primitive Methodist by principle—Wesley to the latest hour of his life, strenuously opposed separation from the Church; he wished them (the Methodists) to be auxiliaries, and not antagonists: he wished that their bond of union should be catholic, and not sectarian; that their zeal should be shewn in promoting the *interests of religion, and not the interests of a party*. These principles are adopted by the author of this pamphlet." It is remarked in the same work, for January, 1826:—"The writer, (Mr. Robinson) urged his opinion in favour of lay representation, with great candour and explicitness, proving the necessity of a reform in their system of government. It might be almost enough for Mr. Robinson to appeal to the treatment itself, which he has experienced from the Methodist authorities, to prove the fact of the exorbitant power vested in the *corps spirituel* of that body. Here (referring to Mr. Johnson and Mr. Galland) we have Methodist superintendents acting with a high hand, and fulminating the bolts of Conference without stint or remorse, on the head of a sincere son of Methodism, whose only error in their estimation can *justly* be, that he differs from them in regard to the materials of which the Conference ought to consist, and that he loves the Church more than the (Dissenting Methodist) Conference."

It will, of course, be asked, whether it was possible for any men, who wished to be considered upright and religious, to attempt to dismiss any one from their communion, and attempt the injury of his character for having published a book containing the very sentiments and feelings of the founder of their Society; nay, the very same which (as to some of them at least) were their own but a few years ago. T. Thompson, Esq. of Hull, was amongst the most violent of my opposers: indeed, his overbearing and unfair conduct

† I am happy, in proof of this, to point the reader to a letter I have just received from one member of the Managing Committee in Dublin, Mr. William Curry, Sacville-street, which does that gentleman great credit, both for liberal sentiment and good feeling. See Article XI.

‡ See *Methodist Magazine* for 1821, p. 123, and this Appendix, Art. XII.

solid and permanent basis prove ineffectual, there are not wanting those who will affect to sneer at the attempt, from first to last; and no doubt some of those, too, who expressed a very different opinion before those difficulties arose. To all these I would observe, that as every care was taken to obtain the opinion of men of the highest character and best talents in the kingdom—many of them men of eminent learning and piety; men who know the world, and are extensively acquainted with the kind of information necessary for giving a sound opinion; and as they were unanimously agreed that Church Methodism is suited to the wants of the country—is calculated to promote the interests of Christianity generally, and those of the Church of England especially,† we were justified in attempting to give it a fair trial; but I would remark further to those who once spoke well of it, that it will be no credit to them to speak slightly of what they so lately admired, *merely because temporary and local difficulties* present themselves; and that with regard to all such, I am firmly persuaded, that they would desert their own mother's son, if they thought they had an interest in so doing.

Others there are, who, with the affectation of superior religious discernment, will profess to see clearly that these difficulties are convincing proofs that Church Methodism cannot be agreeable to Divine Providence, or these hindrances could not have arisen. Such persons, probably, either never knew or have forgotten the infant cause of Judaism—Christianity—the Reformation in England under Wickliffe, who had nearly lost his life in the good cause—nor yet the difficulties attending the establishment of Calvinism—Lutheranism—and Protestantism, under Archbishop Leighton, in Scotland—and Methodism, both in England, America, and Scotland. Did such objectors never read of

at a meeting, held in the vestry of the Methodist chapel, Hull, was such that several of those who voted with him, were so thoroughly ashamed of his proceedings, that after the meeting, they expressed themselves very strongly. Yet, Mr. T. in 1797, took the chair at a public meeting at Leeds, where the following resolution was passed:—"That it is necessary, in order to restore and preserve peace in the Connexion, that two or three delegates from each district should, in future, be at liberty to attend the Conference every year; and that the said delegates should have voices in making or altering the rules of the Methodist Societies, and in the appropriation of the money in the hands of the preachers, on account of the Kingswood School, yearly collection, and book-room."

Several, even of the travelling preachers, were so fully convinced of the reasonableness of admitting representatives into Conference, that in the same year we find the following resolution signed by several of the oldest members of Conference:—"We see no reason to object to the admission of delegates from our Societies into our district meetings—*nor of delegates from our circuits into the Conference*, to assist and advise with us in all matters which properly concern them as representatives of the people."

HANBY	DIXON	LANGLEY	NELSON
SARGEANT	GREAVES	PONKIN	DERMOT
BEAUMONT	PENMAN	ATKINS	MORLEY.

The arbitrary proceedings, however, connected with my trial, did not escape the censure, not only of the respectable writers already quoted, but even of many members of the Methodist Society.

A meeting was held in Hull almost immediately after the one of which I have given the above account, at which *it was unanimously resolved*—"That the subject

† See Dr. Southey's observations at the conclusion of this Appendix.

(whether he was right or wrong in taking such a step) Mr. Wesley's Separation from the Moravians, his Voyages to Germany and America, &c. &c.? Those who are well acquainted with the difficulties Mr. Wesley had to contend with in the first establishment of Methodism, will preserve a prudent silence.

This pamphlet may possibly fall into the hands of some who are men of the world, who will be ready to ask, perhaps, with a sneer, how much better the professors of religion are than the rest of mankind? and be ready to exclaim, (to use the Prophet's words) "aha! aha! so would we have it." Let such remember, that these instances only go to shew the want of more consistent piety in the parties concerned; but form no more objection to Methodism properly constituted, than do the dissimulation of Peter, the treachery of Judas, or the unfaithfulness of our Saviour's first disciples to Christianity. The cowardice, treachery, and injustice which we may meet with in the professors of religion, may lead us to place less confidence in mankind generally, but can never warrant us in turning to the irreligious and prophane, in hope of meeting with better conduct; for if men will act such a part, whose nature, it may reasonably be supposed, has in some degree been benefitted by the religious instructions they have received, what may be expected from those who feel themselves under no religious obligation whatever? Much less should we be justified in suffering these occurrences to make us misanthropic, as it is surely unjust to condemn all for the faults of either the many or the few. I conceive it should lead us to place less confidence in men generally, whether professors of religion or not; but certainly should make us value more highly such (tho' they may be few) whose genuine unaffected piety, good sense, and well regulated minds entitle them to

(respecting which Mr. Robinson was tried at the meeting held at the Waltham-street chapel vestry) was not fairly discussed, and the conclusion was unfair, and calls for our remonstrance."

R. BUTTLE	W. FOSTER	R. HARDY	W. SISSISON
W. LICKIS	F. MORRIS	M. HUNT	G. COOKMAN, SEN.
F. FAWCITT	M. STICKNEY	J. WILKINSON	T. TESSEYMAN.
R. RISPIN	J. DIBB		

Most of these are leaders, and some of them local preachers, most of whom yet remain members of the Dissenting Conference Connexion.

Another meeting was held at Beverley by the trustees of the chapel, Sept. 17th, 1824, at which it was resolved—"That the trustees are decidedly of opinion, that the meeting which decided on his (Mr. Robinson's) case at Hull, was not entitled by the said law (the Law of Pacification) to act in the business; and this meeting does therefore protest against the decision, which was come to at that meeting. *Resolved, 2nd*—That Mr. Galland be requested, accordingly, to summon the trustees, leaders, and stewards, of the Beverley Society, for their decision."

(Signed)

GEORGE COOKMAN	JAMES HENWOOD
JOHN HARRISON	JOHN SHEPHERD
ANTHONY ATKINSON	THOMAS BRIGHAM
G. C. TAYLOR.	

These, it should be recollected, are the resolutions of seven principal trustees, who may be considered competent judges of the question upon which they decided; and that, at least, all of them were not opposed to Methodism, may be argued from the fact, that two of them still remain members of the Conference Connexion.

unbounded confidence. While Heathenism can boast its Damon and Pythius—Judaism can point to its Saul and Jonathan—and Christianity can produce its St. Stephen, St. John, St. Paul, and its noble army of martyrs, who joyfully laid down their lives in proof of their fidelity and attachment to their divine Master, who “loved them and gave himself for them.” It is to be hoped, that even the untoward circumstances which have given occasion to this exposé, will be made eventually subservient to the best interests of all who have acted sincerely in this affair: and if any have acted corruptly, let us hope they will be speedily brought to a better mind.

I have now given, to the best of my knowledge, and with scrupulous exactness, an account of our transactions with the Irish preachers and Irish Conference, and must leave the whole with the public to determine whether our conduct has been corrupt or honest; and whether we have acted a mean or generous part toward them. If in any thing I have fallen into error, and made statements at all varying from the truth, I here once for all publicly declare, that I shall be glad to have such mistakes pointed out. If I have expressed myself with unbecoming severity, I can assure those whom it may concern, that it is the farthest from my desire to do so. If any one should be grieved by these details being given to the public, I can assure them that could they have been settled privately, they never would have been furnished by me. It is only from a desire (which I trust is a right one) to set these facts in a proper light which have been so much misrepresented, and thereby rescue my own character, and that of my friends, from the charges which continue to be circulated to our injury, that I have been induced to publish; and in doing this, I have followed not only the advice of several friends who have long been anxious

A respectable local preacher, in their own Society at Wisbeach, Mr. Edmund Waller, has expressed himself with great freedom on the proceedings; take the following as a specimen:—“Though few of you may be disposed to fall in with Mr. Robinson’s views of uniting the Methodist Societies with the National Church, yet every member among us must feel alarmed at the unscriptural and arbitrary measures adopted to exclude him from the Society. If you ask what was his crime? I reply, he had written a pamphlet, and in that pamphlet he had spoken the truth; for he had published, and he had proved it from Scripture too, that the power which the Conference exercises over our Societies, of making whatever laws they please, for the government of our Society, according to the 7th article, as quoted in page 11, is contrary to the word of God, and a gross invasion of the gospel privileges of our people. *This work of persecution*, begun by Mr. Johnson, was completed by Mr. Galland, under the express direction of the Conference, who not only recommended him to withhold Mr. Robinson’s ticket, but to dismiss all that adhered to him. The outrages committed by the Conference upon Mr. Robinson and his class, may, in our turn, be committed upon us; we are warranted by every law of God and man to associate, in a peaceable manner, for the purpose of repelling such a horrible invasion of our gospel liberties. (*Waller’s Remarks on Sandwith’s Apology*, p. 38.) Indeed, the glaring injustice and jesuitical proceedings of the Methodist preachers, especially of Mr. Johnson and Mr. Galland, against myself and friends, was such as excited the feelings of both Churchmen and Dissenters. It was this which led the *Christian Remembrancer* for February, 1825, to observe:—“*The superintendent is an officer appointed by the Conference; he presides as chairman at the quarterly meetings; his vote is sufficient to prevent any motion being brought forward at a meeting; he can remove any member from the Society; no preacher can officiate without his leave; all good and true Methodists are bound to support him in his measures. Grant these prerogatives to this more than episcopal office, we must also grant that Mr. Robinson, as a good and true Conference Methodist, had nothing to do but to submit*

to see the whole fairly laid before the public, but the example of almost all who have entered into religious discussions and taken any part in public questions. Should any one be of opinion that tho' we were in the right, we ought to have yielded for peace-sake; I reply, that I trust we are as fond of peace as those can be who offer this opinion, yet we did not think ourselves called on to betray the truth, even to purchase that almost invaluable blessing; and were, besides, strongly advised, by those to whose opinions we have long been accustomed to pay great and becoming deference, to stand fast. One eminent divine, who is quoted and admired by a great portion of the British public, observes, "Were I in your place, I would withstand to the uttermost such an invasion of Christian liberty." †

I was not hasty in taking up the subject of Church Methodism, (being nearly two years before I would consent to take steps which were pretty certain to lead to it) urging the incessant call it would, for a long time, make on my time and attention to business; and the unwillingness I felt, (being then at peace with all parties) to involve myself in religious discussions, which would subject me to great misrepresentation and loss in various ways; but after much deliberation and consultation, I refused to shrink from what appeared to me to be a religious duty, knowing that the peace of a conscientious mind can only be retained by a fearless adherence to whatever we believe to be our duty: and therefore I would, after looking on all sides, and weighing, on the one hand, duty and its obligation, against interest and inclination on the other, act with decision, and leave the event to an all-wise and gracious Providence. It has often been a support to my mind, under discouragements, that I have acted in accordance with the advice of

tamely to the orders of his superiors; he was bound to obey them implicitly. But how strong, he it observed, must be that coercion, against which it is even treasonable for the subject to raise his voice, however severely it may press upon him."

But although the Methodist preachers never durst bring my case before the proper persons according to their constitution, to try it; and therefore could not legally *expel* me, yet finding Mr. Galland, the superintendent, very obstinate, I, and a number of other members withdrew, and attempted the establishment of Church Methodism. No one was more loud in praise of our proceedings, on this occasion than Mr. Smelt; and yet, afterwards, when he found it convenient, he could remind me of this separation from the Dissenting Methodists, as forming a reason why we should submit to the terms of Mr. M'Atee and Mr. M'Conkey.

Several pamphlets were published in answer to my "*Observations*," for an account of which the reader is referred to *Article II.*

Mr. James Henwood shrewdly observed at the meeting in Hull, that if I and my friends were to be looked upon as enemies to Methodism, because we were seeking to introduce a representative system into the Methodist Connexion, those good men could not be regarded very differently, who assembled (like the Barons at Runnemede) and compelled the Conference at Leeds, in the year 1797, to listen to them; and yet these persons were known to be amongst the most respectable and firm friends of the Connexion. This acute remark, which, in a few words, was an answer to all the futile arguments used by the partizans of Dissenting Methodism, produced a strong momentary effect, partly owing, no doubt, to its being so self-evident, and partly as coming from Mr. Henwood, whose acknowledged piety and good sense have long given him great and deserved influence in the Hull Society. They soon, however, recovered from their momentary embarrassment, and proceeded with the violence of men, who had but one end, right or wrong, to accomplish.

† See *Article XI.*

several of the wisest and best men in the kingdom. The declaration of the *Christian Guardian*, for July, 1824, I may name as in point—*“Whether the plan proposed by Mr. Robinson should, or should not, ultimately lead to an end so desirable, as a re-union of the Methodists with the Church of England, we believe it would nevertheless produce much good, and be the means of averting many evils.”*

One gentleman, whose name, had I his permission, I should think it an honour and great advantage to mention in this connection, and whose opinion is very highly valued, observes:—*“I will, do, and most happy am I to express my firm conviction, that an approximation of numbers to the doctrines and discipline of our Church, on points of*

I should not have dwelt so long on this subject, but for the reason already given, and shall only make two small additions:—The trustees, in their *‘Appeal to Conference,’* addressed to Mr. Robert Newton, say, “With regard to Mr. R.’s answer, so far as he was permitted to proceed, we think it highly creditable to him, both for its satisfactory argument, and for the very christian and temperate way in which it was conducted. We must in fairness declare, that most men, under the provocations he had to endure, would have been very much irritated. There seemed many persons in the meeting ready to accuse him, who, without having read the pamphlet, came to pass judgment upon it, and that without hearing it read at the meeting, for that was forbidden.

JOHN SHEPHERD
THOMAS BRIGHAM

JOHN HARRISON
G. C. TAYLOR.

The *Christian Remembrancer* is quoted by the trustees, at page 7 of the *‘Appeal,’* to the same effect:—“Even many of the friends of the preachers, who were present, do not deny that Mr. R. had a most unfair trial; and at a subsequent meeting of local preachers, leaders, and others, (who remain Conference Methodists) it was unanimously determined that that was the case.”* The same spirit was manifested at this meeting, which was shewn on the expulsion of other local preachers, referred to by the *Christian Remembrancer* for Feb. 1825, p. 88, where it is said, “But what is principally remarkable in the extracts given above, is the popishness of the excommunications they attempted to enforce. The animosities engendered by so small a difference of opinion—a difference by which no doctrine was impeached, no practice recommended by scripture, affected—marks a spirit congenial with the *Inquisition*, and that would have loved an *Auto da fe*!”

‘Where only opportunity doth want, not will,

“Potential persecution” stands for actual.’

“Of their bigotry we have a striking specimen, in their treatment of the Tent Methodists.”

Too much of the same spirit is manifested in two pamphlets lately published by Messrs. Sandwith and Galkaud. The latter of whom has, from the beginning, exhibited a very overbearing and unchristian conduct.

I have already shewn how little reason Mr. Thompson and others had to be angry with me, for advocating a representative system in the Connexion, as they had in 1797, done the same; and as to my wishing for a union with the Church of England, they had as little reason to complain: for in the same year we find Mr. John Horton, of London, Mr. Stonehouse, of Manchester; Mr. Arthur Keene, of Dublin; Mr. THOMAS THOMPSON, of Hull; and several others, appointed to carry into effect certain rules, &c. made in 1795, “for the purpose of preserving and perpetuating Primitive Methodism in connexion with the Established Church; and to SEE THAT OUR RULES AND AGREEMENTS ARE FAITHFULLY KEPT, BOTH BY PREACHERS AND PEOPLE.”† May I not ask, whether Mr. Thompson would not have been doing much better, in fulfilling his trust, than opposing me very angrily for trying to do what he had left undone?

* See this Appendix, Article I. page 45—note.

† See Minutes of Proceedings of a Meeting of Delegates, held in Leeds, 1797, Mr. Thomas Thompson, of Hull, in the chair.

"the highest importance, is likely to result from your undertaking, and cannot but be productive of the greatest good."

Similar was the encouragement I received from one of the first literary characters now living, Robert Southey, Esq. L. L. D. of Keswick: "One thing," says he, "I am very certain of, that a body of Church Methodists can do for the Church, what the Church cannot do for itself; and that it may be eminently useful in many ways."

When I was honoured, about two years ago, with a call from Bishop Chase, I explained to him at length the nature of Church Methodism, when that venerable and eminent prelate held up both his hands, and said—"IT IS THE MOST GLORIOUS PLAN THAT EVER WAS THOUGHT OF."

Mr. Thompson and his friends, referred to here, were not the only leading Methodists who wished Methodism to remain in union with the Church. Most of the trustees of Methodist chapels in the kingdom passed resolutions to that effect. I shall quote two or three from them in our neighbourhood:—

"It is our opinion, that any departure from the good old tried form, by the introduction of ordination, baptism, the sacraments, burial of the dead, with all the circumstantialities that must eventually make the Methodists formal Dissenters, is injurious to the interests of Methodism, and ought to be resisted."

Signed by the trustees of the Pocklington and Market-Weighton Chapel, 17th November, 1794.

WM. ROGERSON	MICHAEL CLARKSON	JOHN CATTON
FRANCIS BLANCHARD	JOHN BARKER	JOHN HARPER
BARNARD CLARKSON	HENRY BELL	WM. WADE.

"It is our determined and unanimous resolution, to support, with all our power, those preachers and trustees who continue upon the old Conference plan." In referring to the introduction of the sacraments into the Methodist chapels, (which at that time was almost universally objected to by the Societies,) they say, "We highly approve of the conduct of those trustees, in the resistance they made to those whose sole aim appears to be their own aggrandisement, overturning the *original* plan of Methodism, so happily established, and so amazingly blessed to the salvation of many thousands."

Letter from the trustees of chapels at Burlington Quay and Nafferton.—Nov. 1794.

THOS. ROBINSON	WM. SKELTON	ROBT. JEFFERSON
WM. ROBINSON	GEO. KNOWLES	ROBT. SHERWOOD
WM. COVERLEY	MICHAEL THOMPSON	VALENTINE BARKER
BENJ. SEDMAN	JOHN FROSTE	WM. USHAW.
THOS. LINTON	JOHN BARKER	

"It is with sensible concern that we have perceived the evils now complained of, advancing by slow degrees, a considerable time back; our old venerable father, Mr. Wesley, perceived it also; but out of condescension to some popular aspiring characters, was induced to make too great concessions. We are resolved not to give countenance to any innovations, but to support such means as have the strongest tendency to bring Methodism to its most perfect and original standard. We shall always look upon those preachers, who, by any means, (secret or open) wish to introduce ceremonies into our chapels, as enemies to the peace of our Zion."

From Trustees of the Chapels of Howden, Eastington, and River Bridge—1794.

(Signed)

JAMES LONGBOTTOM	RICHD. WARD	HENRY BELL
JOHN BARKER	BARN. CLARKSON	H. BELL, jun.
JOHN WOOD	GEO. FLINT	WM. GOUNDRILL
WM. SINGLETON	JOSEPH BLYTH	RICH. WEDDLE.

Nay, even the Conference itself, in 1793, was of the same mind:—"We are determined, as a body, to remain in connexion with the Church of England."—*Min. of Conference*, vol. i. p. 281.

ARTICLE II.

REMARKS ON MR. H. SANDWITH'S PAMPHLET.

It will be at once perceived, from the very titles of the pamphlets to which this and the following articles relate, (see preface) that the Dissenting Conference preachers attempted to exclude the author of the '*Observations on the System of Methodism*,' for having dared to publish the book. For a brief account of this affair, the reader is referred to a note at page 42 of this Appendix, Article I.

The first pamphlet mentioned in this list, '*Observations, &c. on Methodism*,' was in the hands of the public about twelve months before any reply was attempted. The writer knows that a friend of his asked a methodist travelling preacher, soon after its publication, if he thought it would receive any reply—and was answered that he thought it would not: "indeed," said he, "we cannot answer it." Another very leading member of Conference remarked, about the same time, that it was his opinion, the Conference must by and bye open its doors to representatives from the Societies. At length, however, Messrs. Welch, Sandwith, and Galland appeared as the apologists of the system of Methodism; but certainly, judging from what the author conceives to be the public opinion, with very poor success.

The author stands in some measure pledged to answer Mr. Sandwith's pamphlet, but his engagements have been such, independent of the trouble which he has had with the affair detailed in the foregoing Letter, that he has not yet been able to do more than make a few cursory remarks upon it in the preface and notes to the second edition of his '*Observations*:' and some of his friends are of opinion, that every thing of consequence in Mr. H. Sandwith's '*Apology*' is, in those remarks, so fully and fairly answered, as to render any further reply quite unnecessary; unless he wished it to be said of him, as of Alexander the Great—

" And thrice he routed all his foes,

" And thrice he slew the slain."

The part he had been induced to take (at the solicitation of respectable friends, and what he conceived to be a sense of duty) in the establishment of Church Methodism, had so occupied his time and mind, that he found it necessary, a short time ago, to resume a close attention to business, which he purposes to continue; and he thinks that not even the satisfaction of more fully correcting the errors Mr. H. Sandwith has fallen into, relative to the first edition of his '*Observations*,' will induce him to appear again before the public. At any rate, if ever that should be the case, it will in all probability be many years hence, if even then: as it is not impossible but, should he have entire leisure, he may listen to a recommendation which he has received from a respectable quarter, to write a '*History of Methodism*'. Should he ever do this, an opportunity may be afforded of dwelling at length on the points in dispute between him and Mr. Sandwith. Under present circumstances, the writer will content himself, with a few general remarks on these pamphlets, as well as on a scurrilous article in the *Methodist Magazine*.

As Mr. H. Sandwith's pamphlet is "*more temperate and judicious*" than either of the other, the writer will notice it more particularly; and especially, because he understands Mr. H. S. and some of his friends are under some misapprehension respecting his treatment of him, in the preface and notes to the 2nd edition of his '*Observations.*' Between Mr. H. Sandwith and the writer, it is well known the most intimate friendship existed for years; such as, Mr. H. S. once observed, was scarcely surpassed by that which existed between Saul and Jonathan; and therefore the writer always regretted that Mr. H. S. was becoming his opponent, after he was informed, on good authority, what kind of a pamphlet he was about to publish. He had indulged the pleasing hope, when he was first told of Mr. H. S.'s intention to become his opponent, that they should have carried on a religious controversy with christian meekness, avoiding every thing which would give each other pain, and manifesting the utmost fairness and impartiality. Should Mr. H. S. or any of his friends, think the writer has acted uncourteously towards him, he begs to call their attention to two or three passages in his remarks on the '*Apology,*' and to contrast them with what other writers have said of the same work:—

"He waited the more willingly to see the production, and promised "Mr. H. S. that if he should be convinced of his errors, he would publicly thank him 'for his better information, or more correct reasoning.' "The author also begged him to avoid all personalities, and confine himself to the argument, observing, 'A few years more, and we shall have done. To one of us the melancholy intelligence will probably be conveyed, that the other is no more. What then will be our feelings, what our readiness to put the best construction on doubtful actions? As one of us as shall then feel, may we feel now; and our contest will leave no sting behind, no painful remembrance at the retrospect.'" (*Preface to 'Observations,' p. 3.*)

"—— the testimony he bears to my character in his introduction, "and for which I here publicly thank him." (*Ib. page 16.*)

"In conclusion, the author begs leave to state, that should the pamphlet fall into the hands of those who disregard the doctrines and precepts of religion, and who imagine that they will be accused of scepticism, or neglect of religion, because its professors are not agreed on the *non-essential* doctrines of Christianity, let such recollect, that difference of opinion on minor doctrines, is quite compatible with the firmest belief in the *essential* truths of Christianity, which are, comparatively, but few and simple. This difference arises, in some measure, from the different construction of the human mind, which shews itself on other subjects, as well as those of a religious nature; but it is, perhaps, chiefly to be attributed to that weakness and imperfection of our nature, which renders us so subject to the prejudices of education, and the force of long-established habits and opinions. If such readers expect absolute perfection on this side the grave, they look for more than any of the parties profess, or than they will ever find in this world. Let us charitably hope, that the contending parties are influenced by none but the best motives; and that, in any instances in which they have been betrayed into unwarrantable expressions or unjustifiable opinions, the fault is to be chiefly attributed to an undue portion of zeal, rather

"than any deliberate intention to do wrong. The writer can sincerely state, that with regard to Mr. Sandwith and Mr. Galland, though he cannot but believe that they have unhappily given way to momentary feelings of indignation, which has led them to do him injustice; yet, from long knowledge of them both, he feels assured that it has arisen from mis-information or mis-apprehension: beside, in the heat of controversy, and especially if the subject be such as the parties feel intensely upon, the worst passions of our poor fallen nature are excited for the time, and proceedings follow too frequently, of which the individuals hereafter sincerely and humbly repent. Let us recollect,



"That he who might the 'vantage ta'en the best,
"Found out the remedy"—

"and let the reader, and the author of these pages, join in devout remembrance, that such instances of human weakness, as those referred to, should rather excite their pity and compassion than their resentment, remembering, that they themselves have much to be forgiven. (*Preface to 'Observations,' p. 10.*)

It is to be hoped that these passages will go some way toward shewing the writer's feelings to Mr. H. S. at the time the second edition was written. If it be said, there is another pamphlet, entitled, '*An Appeal to Conference,*' by Messrs. Shepherd, Brigham, Harrison, and Taylor, which was published with the writer's concurrence, and in which the same good spirit is not to be found, the author replies, that he should not fear to hold himself accountable for every sentence it contains on that subject. But let the reader judge:—

"Mr. H. S. seems wholly to have failed in his attempt to answer Mr. R.'s pamphlet, and especially to shew that the Methodist preachers are not seeking episcopal ordination. If what Mr. Robinson has already advanced, in a note on the subject in the 2nd edition of the '*Observations,*' is not fully satisfactory, we would refer him to '*Crowther's Life of Dr. Coke,*' which he does not appear to have read; and we would especially refer him to the following letter of ordination, given by Dr. Coke to certain missionaries:—

"These are to certify to all whom it may concern, that on the — day of — one thousand — I, Thomas Coke, Doctor of Civil Law, Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, did, in the fear of God, and with a single eye to his glory, by the imposition of my hands and prayer, (being assisted by several ordained Elders of the Church of God) set apart — for the office of an Elder in the Church of God, being persuaded that he was a fit person for that holy office. And I do, accordingly, recommend him as duly qualified to feed the Church of God, and to administer the Holy Sacraments. Given under my hand and seal, the day and year above named.

"THOMAS  Seal.  COKE."

"We beg a word with Mr. H. Sandwith at parting. It is not our most distant intention to offend him, in making these free, but we hope not unkind, remarks on his pamphlet; and we trust he will receive our

"reproof as we intend it. If he should write again, he will do well to guard against an improper spirit, and avoid whatever is dogmatical and personal. Let him fairly meet the arguments of the case, instead of shewing himself irritated. Surely Mr. R. or any one else, may write a pamphlet on Methodism, without offending Mr. H. S. We would also recommend him to aim at a more simple natural manner of writing: any attempt to be dignified on a plain subject, is in bad taste—It

"—— resembles ocean into tempest wrought,

"To waft a feather or to drown a fly."

"We are induced to offer him this advice, because we have lately been informed by Mr. R. (and we think it but justice to him to name it) that from what he has heard, he is inclined to believe that Mr. H. S. did not intend to publish any thing which would be condemned for its severity, as he understood he had committed his manuscript copy to some friends. We apprehend the fact to be this, that at the time he had suffered his mind to be irritated by Mr. R.'s '*Observations on Methodism*,' he had sat down and written under such unhappy impression; and having beside a peculiar and somewhat unfortunate manner of expressing himself, approaching too much to the dignified and pompous, he has published what makes rather a different impression to the one he might intend to give. We particularly recommend to Mr. H. S.'s attention, the last four pages of Mr. R.'s '*Observations*.'

But it is possible Mr. H. S. and his friends may think that a very different character to this ought to have been given of his '*Apology for Methodism*' by these trustees. But what say impartial by-standers? What sort of character is given of this production by all who have noticed it, except the *Methodist Magazine*, whose praise is matter of course. To begin first with a long and able MS. review of Mr. H. S.'s '*Apology*,' from which an extract is given in the trustees' '*Appeal to Conference*.' It is written by a clergyman, who possesses a good knowledge of the subject on which he writes:—

"'It is his (Mr. Sandwith's) duty to undeceive the public.' But how does he undeceive them? NOT BY CONTRADICTING ONE FACT; NOT BY DISPROVING ONE ARGUMENT. What fallacious reasoning about the distinction between making new rules, and repeating old ones. What, if the Conference can make a new law, can it not repeal an old one? May not the new law be the subversion of an old one; and might not half a dozen new laws be made at the next Conference, which should repeal every law which has hitherto given a shadow of power to the people? And if such a law were made, and were at the first quarter day objected to by every Society in England, has not the Conference the power, in the face of all the Societies, to render them the fixed and permanent laws of Methodism? Mr. S. cannot deny that the power exists, and he cannot deny that it ought not to exist."

Mr. Edmund Waller, of Wisbeach, though himself a local preacher in the very same Connexion with Mr. H. Sandwith, has expressed himself with great freedom on this subject:—

"The writer of these remarks having but little time to think, and much less to write, it cannot, therefore, be expected that he should follow Mr. Sandwith through all his laboured remarks upon Mr.

"Robinson's '*Observations*,' especially as his object appears not to be
 "the plain developement of truth, but rather how he may dress up and
 "dispose of that truth in a way most to his own advantage. As a mem-
 "ber of the Methodist Society, I feel sorry that Mr. Robinson has said
 "so little on the subject of that unscriptural authority which the
 "Conference exercise over our Societies; and that his own peculiar
 "views, in reference to the formation of a union with the Establishment,
 "should have rendered his work so unpopular among our people.
 "Nevertheless, we are bound to give him credit for his good intentions,
 "and no doubt but his '*Observations on the System of Wesleyan Method-*
 "*ism*' will prove useful to our Societies. As we feel no disposition
 "to coincide in our present religious connexion with the Wesleyan
 "Methodists, by associating with the Church, we have no quarrel with
 "Mr. Robinson on that point; and shall pass over in silence every thing
 "that Mr. Sandwith has advanced in reply to Mr. Robinson on that
 "subject, making only a few remarks on such parts of Mr. Sandwith's
 "pamphlet, as concern us as Wesleyan Methodists. Before we proceed
 "to page 8, where our author has thrown the gauntlet, and advanced to
 "the attack, as if scripture and common sense were both on his side, we
 "beg leave to remark on a few observations contained in the preceding
 "pages of his pamphlet. Here, Sir, I take it for granted, that the great
 "point in debate with Mr. Robinson and you, is the subject of Church
 "government, viz. the right which Conference claim and exercise of
 "making what new rules they judge proper for the government of our
 "Societies; for this you elsewhere acknowledge is the most material
 "objection brought forward by Mr. Robinson on the subject. You
 "say, (page 3) 'but if serious and lasting mischiefs flow from such pre-
 "'sumption (as Mr. R. has been the subject of) what atonement can be
 "'made, either to the Church for the souls which unnecessary contro-
 "'versy turns aside from godliness, or to the world for the temptations
 "'wantonly given to the enemies of religion to blaspheme?' I suppose,
 "from this quotation, you mean to be understood, that this controversy
 "about the dominion of the Conference, is unnecessary; and that it is
 "calculated to turn souls aside from godliness, &c. Now, sir, these
 "consequences we deny; and we deny them for the following reasons:
 "1st. Because the power thus claimed and exercised by the Conference,
 "is contrary to scripture, and an unjust abridgment of the gospel privi-
 "leges of our Societies; and therefore it cannot be an unnecessary
 "controversy. 2nd. Because we see no necessary connexion, between
 "turning souls aside from godliness, and our peaceably contending for
 "those privileges which are according to godliness; and as the occasion
 "thus given to the enemies of religion to blaspheme, appears to be the
 "exposure of that which is wrong, the cause of reproach must rest with
 "the Conference, who deny us the exercise of our gospel privileges as
 "Church members, and not with those who peaceably contend for them.
 "Thus, Mr. Sandwith, the certain mischiefs are found on your side of
 "the question; but the path of duty and safety is found in strict ad-
 "herence to divine truth."

One would suppose Mr. Waller had discovered something more
 than a candid, kind, quiet, and argumentative pamphlet, to write at this
 rate; and the writer has passed by some of the more severe passages in

Mr. Waller's remarks, though he fears Mr. H. Sandwith will think these severe enough.

The *Christian Guardian* for November, 1825, observes:—"We are charged (by the *Methodist Magazine*) with not noticing Messrs. Sandwith and Welch's pamphlets. We thought Mr. Sandwith's pamphlet unworthy of notice; but we never heard of Mr. Welch's until it was reviewed in the *Methodist Magazine*. We have since read it, and think still more meanly of it than of Mr. S.'s production. Mr. Robinson's '*Observations*' can never be silenced by such inconclusive reasoners as Messrs. Welch and Sandwith." Vol. xvii. p. 440.

The *Christian Remembrancer* for January, 1826, remarks:—"We were well disposed to hear what Messrs. Welch, Sandwith, and Galland had to urge in answer to Mr. Robinson's '*Observations*.' The result of our reading, however, we must confess, has not been satisfactory. We do not find that they have succeeded in removing the weight of those imputations, which Mr. R. had brought against their ecclesiastical polity." Vol. viii. p. 14.

So again, in the same work:—"In the first part of his '*Apology*,' he (Mr. Sandwith) discusses the justice of Mr. Robinson's strictures on the law of the Conference before alluded to, and contends that Mr. R. has not fairly inferred that the law in question was only a delusive surrender of power into the hands of the people. *But we see nothing in his arguments, to make us alter the opinion which we had formed of the correctness of Mr. R.'s view of the subject.* In pursuing the defence of his party, he (Mr. H. S.) has fallen into the like palpable inconsistency with the others. He asserts the validity of Conference ordination, and attributes the separation of the Methodists from the Church, to the want of an evangelical and holy priesthood in the Establishment; (p. 53) acknowledging, at the same time, that 'Christ instituted a distinct order of men to be the pastors and executive rulers of his Church;' (p. 35) and agreeing with Lord Bacon, that 'heresies and schisms are, of all others, the greatest scandals; yea, more than the corruption of manners.' (p. 83.) Strange it is that these principles, which are so obvious to them as *Methodists*, should be utterly unknown to them as members of the *Church*."

The reader will not, it is conceived, be at a loss to know whether the remarks on Mr. H. S.'s '*Apology*,' in the preface and notes to the 2nd edition of the '*Observations*,' or those made on him by every other person (the writer in the *Methodist Magazine* only excepted) who has noticed his pamphlet, are the more severe. The author has heard two or three times of late, that he has been censured for having quoted a MS. written by Mr. H. S. but not printed. As he would not willingly do wrong, neither would he wish it to be thought he had, and therefore he will give a brief account of the matter here, and leave his readers to judge.

A short time before the publication of the 1st edition of the '*Observations*,' the author wrote to Mr. H. S. a friendly confidential letter, stating his views on certain particulars in the system of Methodism, and begging his advice. Instead of returning a friendly answer, replying to the author's enquiries, Mr. H. S. wrote a very severe unfriendly letter, in a tone and manner altogether unbecoming both

himself and his subject. Shortly after he heard, from a friend of Mr. H. S.'s, that he (Mr. H. S.) had shewn the author's private letter to the preachers and others, and had also shewn a copy of his own letter to the preachers and many others. As he (the author of the '*Observations*') received this information from a friend of Mr. H. S.'s, to whom both the letters had been shewn, the writer thought he was no longer bound to keep either of them private; but that as Mr. H. S. had shewn them, (and as he was then informed, and believed) *extensively*, and had made his own comments upon them, it was but fair that in return, he should be at liberty to make his comments also. Being one day at the house of a gentleman of great respectability in Mr. H. S.'s neighbourhood, and thinking it very probable that he had heard something of this MS. the writer shewed it him, and asked his opinion of it. The next time the writer had the pleasure of visiting that gentleman, he told him he had understood that Mr. H. S. was offended with his having shewn him the letter, and asked his opinion, observing, that if he thought he had done wrong in shewing it, he would apologize to Mr. H. S. The gentleman replied, "By no means, I think you are perfectly at liberty to print it if you please. Finding that a copy of this document was not only shewn in Mr. H. S.'s own neighbourhood, but was also sent to Beverley, and shewn amongst the writer's friends here, he conceived himself most perfectly at liberty to make a public use of it. But before he did so, he took the precaution of asking the advice of some judicious intelligent friends, who concurred in the propriety of its publication. In publishing the 2nd edition of his '*Observations*,' the writer took an opportunity of remarking on Mr. H. S.'s sudden change of opinion, and especially on the very positive way in which these new opinions were advanced. The principal use which either the writer or his friends made of this MS. may be seen in the following quotation from the trustees' '*Appeal to Conference*':—

"How different is the impression given of the '*Observations*' by those two able periodicals, (the *Christian Guardian* and *Christian Remembrancer*) to that given by Messrs. Sandwith, Galland, and Welch. Mr. H. Sandwith and Mr. Welch do not appear very fully to understand the subject; and beside, were so lately opposed to the Conference, that so far as relates to their mere opinions and assertions, they will not weigh so much with either preachers or people, as they would have done under other circumstances. The want of good temper, and apparent want of fair investigation, render their productions less satisfactory; for a man who has a good cause to defend, has no occasion to substitute insulting language and personalities for sound argument. As far as we have heard, these two publications have been but poorly received by the more intelligent and respectable people in our own neighbourhood. Whether this has arisen from the inconclusiveness of the arguments, the want of simplicity in the style, or the remarkable want of candour and good temper they display, we cannot determine. It has, no doubt, excited the surprise at least, of many readers, that Mr. H. Sandwith, who circulated a manuscript in his own own hand writing, a few months ago, in which he has advertised so severely on the Methodist preachers, and exhorted the Society to persevere in their attempt to obtain a representation of the

"people in Conference, should now come forward as the apologist of the system, and denounce something like a curse on any one who should attempt to do what he himself has just been doing. Contrast the following passages :—

"In his manuscript, he says, 'I am so persuaded, however, of the increasing domination of our preachers, that I think it highly desirable the people should be represented in Conference. Your historical illustrations of so unnatural a state of things, as a Conference without such representation, are very apposite and striking. Sufficient materials of abuse have accumulated, to justify some steps being taken by the people to accomplish reform.' Again—'Let the reform so much to be desired in Methodism, be accomplished by petition, remonstrance, and argument, reiterated until either truth shall be heard, or corruption reach its acmé.' "

"In his pamphlet, he says, 'And if Methodism deem it expedient to innovate somewhat more than its founders thought necessary, woe to the man who will impiously attempt to stay its career of usefulness.' "

"In his introduction, he informs us, that 'at one time,' (not several years since, but a few months ago) 'and before his attention had been drawn with any seriousness to the subject, he was favourable to the representative system; and on this account,' he says, 'he has avoided a discussion of the subject of the Methodist Societies sending delegates to Conference.' "

"Perhaps some of his readers will think, that he who would write so positively on a subject which he confesses he had not attentively considered, may have been guilty of the same fault in his pamphlet, and that he may by and bye change sides again. Nor is it an unnatural supposition, that Mr. H. Sandwith may still be friendly to representation: indeed we can scarcely conceive how he can be otherwise, as we understand he holds what are called liberal (whig) principles. Considering that he was educated a strict Dissenter, we can the better understand why he may prefer *Dissenting* to *Church* Methodism."

The writer has lately been assured, that Mr. H. S. did not, in the first instance, shew the MS. to many persons; and that he had a particular reason for shewing it to the Methodist preachers, which was to convince them that he was not in friendly correspondence with the writer; as they had accused him of being more unfriendly to Methodism than he really was.

In concluding these remarks on Mr. H. S. the writer is anxious finally to express his opinion on the subject of their public controversy. —He feels he has a nice and delicate task to perform, in the plan he has adopted for dismissing Mr. Sandwith's pamphlet, (for the present at least) with a few extracts and general remarks. Had he sat down fully and fairly to reply to it, he would have taken the arguments up *seriatim*; but confined as he necessarily is to a few pages, he is obliged to content himself with what is little more than the mere assertion of himself and the reviewers; which he fears will give the Article an unsatisfactory, if not an unkind appearance. He should probably have excused himself from returning any further answer to it, than he has already done in his '*Observations*,' especially considering the tender friendship which once existed between him and the author of the

'*Apology*,' had he not been informed that Mr. H. Sandwith and some of his friends thought he had treated him severely in what he had already published in his notes, &c. to his '*Observations*.' Hence he has copied several passages from those notes, &c. and contrasted them with what has been written by those who are in the situation of independent by-standers; and he trusts his readers will not be of opinion that Mr. H. S. has any reason to complain.

The charges in Mr. H. S.'s '*Apology*' against the writer, of "ignorance," "latitudenarianism," "false shew of liberality," "remarkable want of candour," "dishonouring his pages," &c. &c. &c. he will pass by, as being no more than the hasty expressions of the moment. There is but one very direct charge against the writer, in all his pamphlet: it occurs at the 14th page, in which Mr. H. S. says, "For what he thus most disingenuously conceals from his less informed readers, &c." As the writer felt this to be an unjust charge, and one impeaching his moral character, he thought it right to complain; and is happy to inform his readers, that Mr. H. S. has had the fairness and candour to assure him that he did not intend to convey any charge against the writer's intention, or in any degree to impeach his moral character. With regard to any *severe* expression indulged in by the reviewers of Mr. H. Sandwith's pamphlet, the writer wishes it to be understood, he does not join, as he has great pleasure in recurring to those early days of their friendship, when neither of them could have heard an unkind word spoken of the other, without regarding it as spoken of himself. The writer takes this public opportunity of saying that he most heartily forgives whatever Mr. H. Sandwith has written against him; and apologizes for any unbecoming expression or improper word which may have escaped himself, either in this Article or in the notes and preface to his '*Observations*,' and trusts that they will thus agree to leave the controversial field better friends than they entered it. The writer is convinced that they know too much of each other, ever long to indulge in mutual unkind feelings; and that had not distance of situation prevented their frequently meeting each other, they never would have appeared before the world as opponents.

In conclusion, the writer begs to observe, that though this brief method of disposing of the '*Apology*,' and the desire to free himself from the charge of having treated Mr. H. Sandwith with severity, has not so fully enabled him to do justice to the good feeling he desires to cultivate towards Mr. H. Sandwith in his private character as he wished; yet he trusts he may, with truth, close this article in the words with which Mr. H. S. closes his introduction:—"FINALLY, THE WRITER HAS AVOIDED ALL PERSONALITIES BEYOND THOSE FOR WHICH THE PAMPHLET, WHICH IS BEFORE THE WORLD, IS FAIRLY RESPONSIBLE. HIS CONTROVERSY WITH THE AUTHOR IS NOT IN HIS PRIVATE, BUT IN HIS PUBLIC CHARACTER. CONTEMPLATING HIM IN THE FORMER OF THESE RELATIONS, HE IS HAPPY, FROM LONG ACQUAINTANCE, TO BEAR TESTIMONY TO HIS LIFE BEING ADORNED WITH NUMEROUS VIRTUES."

ARTICLE III.

REMARKS ON MR. WELCH'S PAMPHLET.

From the extracts given at page 58, it will be seen that Mr. H. Sandwith was as much opposed to the unscriptural and unreasonable power of Conference, as the author of the '*Observations*'; and it is not a little remarkable, that his other two opponents, Mr. Welch and Mr. Galland, were on the same side.

Mr. Welch seemed anxious to stand as fair as possible with the Conference respecting this, and hence in his pamphlet he says—"The author considers it his duty to express his opinion very explicitly, as a report has gone forth that he is controverting sentiments he once espoused and circulated. He admits he has, on sundry occasions, deprecated in strong language, the mal-administration of the Methodist polity by some preachers, who have veiled their personal characters as gentlemen and Christians, in an ignoble shade; language which he sees no reason to retract or disown; but, of the system of Wesleyan Methodism, he has invariably approved: and the reason for such estimation will be found in his publication."

But two of his quondam friends (Mr. Hirst and Mr. Graham, of Hull,) published a letter immediately on this making its appearance, in which they flatly deny it, and shew that *he had been recently much opposed to the system of Methodism*. The Independent Methodists at Driffield, on being referred to, said they recollected his recent speeches against the power of the Conference preachers. He was well known to have one favourite recommendation—of curtailing their power, that the people should refuse their contributions; or to use his own phrase, "*that the people should keep their pennies in their pockets.*" He had, a very short time before the publication of his pamphlet, gone over to the Independent Methodists, at least so far as to walk a distance of more than 20 miles (from Hull to Driffield) to preach frequently for them; and when he applied for re-admission into the Conference Connexion, the preachers refused to receive him, on account of his want of attachment to Methodism. After the publication of Messrs. Graham & Hirst's letter in the *Hull Advertiser*, we hear little more of Mr. Welch, and it was remarked he did not find it convenient to make any reply.* Yet this is the man who has the assurance to state, on the authority of some idle report, that the author of the '*Observations*' had prevaricated respecting a letter written to Scarbro', than which there could not be any thing more untrue. It may not be amiss here to repeat what the author said on this subject, in the preface to the 2nd edit. of his '*Observations*', p. 5.

"It was judged proper by Mr. R. and his friends, before any propositions respecting a change in the system of Methodism was introduced into the Hull quarterly meeting, that such respectable members of the Methodist Society as it was desirable to consult, should be first written to for their opinion. Mr. R. and some of his friends,

* See Messrs. Graham & Hirst's Letter, in this Appendix, Article XIII.

“in consequence, wrote to several persons on the occasion. One of their letters written to Scarbro’, came into the hands of Mr. Johnson, the superintendent Methodist preacher in Hull, who cited him before himself and a meeting of local and travelling preachers; but this meeting having no cognizance of the case, Mr. R. proposed to meet him and a few friends, to converse on the subject. At this second meeting, Mr. Johnson produced the Scarbro’ letter, and demanded of Mr. R. if he was the writer—informing him at the same time, that he need not deny it, as he had seen a note written by him, and knew that letter to be in his hand writing. Mr. R. observed, that he had twice before, in the local preachers’ meeting, said that he wished it to be distinctly understood, that he did not at all shrink from the letter, nor did he then; but that he had been advised by several highly respectable gentlemen to resist any inquisitorial proceedings on the part of the preachers, and that convening meetings for such purposes, and calling them ‘courts,’ was viewed by some with considerable jealousy. However, as Mr. Johnson had said that he knew the Scarbro’ letter to be in Mr. R.’s own hand writing, he would just inform him and the meeting, that there was not a word of it his writing, nor was it his composition. On Mr. Johnson’s replying, that the meeting had only Mr. R.’s own word for it, he appealed to all present, and asked if there was one person who doubted his word; since, if there was, he could produce the gentleman who wrote it. They all instantly said, they did not in the least doubt his word; and Mr. James Henwood, one of the local preachers, made some very suitable observations to Mr. Johnson on his rashness. Mr. R. then informed the meeting, that he had lent his name to the letter, and was therefore entirely accountable for it, and was ready to defend it; that if he had composed it himself, he should probably have expressed one thing in it rather differently, though the sense of the letter would, on the whole, have been just the same. The local preachers in that meeting know, that this is an exact account of what passed—and Mr. R.’s friends know that both in public and private, this is the account he has uniformly given; and yet, out of this, it has been attempted to make a charge of prevarication against him; *whereas the mis-statement was on the part of the Methodist preacher, who asserted that he knew that to be the hand writing of Mr. R., which, in fact, was the writing of another person.*”

The only notice taken of Mr. Welch’s pamphlet by the *Christian Guardian* for November, 1825, is the following:—“We never heard of Mr. Welch’s pamphlet, until it was reviewed in the *Methodist Magazine*. We have since read it, and think still more meanly of it than of Mr. S.’s (Sandwith’s) production.”

The *Christian Remembrancer* for January, 1826, has the following observations:—“But Mr. Welch is singularly unhappy; *whatever he aims at establishing, he generally proves the reverse.* Thus he wishes to argue against any resemblance between Papal supremacy and Conference supremacy; but the result is what he might call ‘anomalous,’ for the root of Papal power is infallibility, and this is exactly what Mr. Welch claims for Conference, since nothing can be more infallible than the decisions of a body guided by a special Divine

“Providence:’ (p. 23) nothing can be more absolute and perfect than “a system which ‘the Almighty is shewing to the nations of the earth;’ but the strongest part of this argument is, that Conference is supposed “to have been specially directed by the Almighty to resist lay delegation, because the measure itself ‘appears to the natural mind so “‘reasonable!’ Mr. W. says, their resistance can be accounted for on no “other principle: but that no doubt may remain of the supremacy against “which he argues, he proceeds in the next page to mention some collateral facts, all tending to the same point, and calculated to give the “preachers ‘a greater command and ascendancy over the people’— “such as petitioning for particular men. ‘In fact,’ says he, ‘the whole “‘goes to prostrate the people at the feet of men, who, a short time “‘before, were such as themselves.’ (p. 25.) Before! may we not “venture to ask, what they are after? are they not such as themselves?— “—‘No,’ Mr. W. would say, ‘they now belong to a holy conclave of “‘pastors, having a “scriptural superiority” over the people.’ One or “two passages, in which he asserts this superiority, ought to be submitted to the reader, as specimens of Mr. Welch’s High Conference “Methodism:—

“We find ourselves so perpetually enveloped in fog, as we attempt “to explore Mr. Welch’s profound thinkings, that we are forced to “abandon our voyage of discovery; and must return from our arduous “undertaking, content with having collected a few curiosities which “fell in our way. One observation, however, we would make upon “the whole. WHY, WE WOULD ASK, IS ALL THIS PARADE MADE ABOUT “THE POWER OF THE PREACHERS, AS DISTINCT FROM THAT OF THE “PEOPLE? AS FAR AS WE CAN PERCEIVE, MR. WESLEY DID NOT “CONSIDER HIS PREACHERS, UNLESS THEY WERE CLERGYMEN WHO “HAD BEEN ORDAINED IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, AS ANY MORE “THAN LAYMEN: HE CALLS THEM ‘LAY PREACHERS,’ SO THAT THOSE “WHO NOW LIFT THEMSELVES UP ABOVE THE PEOPLE, IN HIS ESTIMATION, BELONGED TO THE PEOPLE. THE POWER, THEREFORE, “WHICH THEY HAVE ASSUMED, AS A MINISTERIAL BODY, DOES NOT “DESCEND TO THEM UPON WESLEYAN PRINCIPLES.”

“But the most remarkable specimen of his skill in calculation, is “that mockery of a proportion, which is stated in these terms:—as “ $21\frac{1}{2} : 325 :: 121 : 1808\frac{4}{5}\%$. With all this parade of fractions of “a circuit, and fractions of a man, what will his fourth proportional “prove, when his first term is an average number; a second, a specific “number; and his third, a total? No one of the three has any correspondence with either of the others; the first is the average number of “circuits in the new Connexion (which has tried the expedient of lay “representation) for 22 years past; the second is the actual number of “circuits in the old Connexion last year; the third is the total of “preachers, who, in 22 years, have delegated to Conference, instead of “laymen, in the new Connexion; and apparently the last is intended to “represent the number likely to be delegated in one year to the old “Connexion Conference.”

Mr. Welch admitted to a friend of his, that if the author of the “*Observations on the System of Methodism*’ should succeed in disproving what is contained in the following quotation, his pamphlet would

be overthrown:—"Does not Mr. R. know, that a quarterly meeting, even if the travelling preachers be present, possesses no more power than what the circuit stewards also chose to give it? Let the circuit stewards withdraw, and all business is at a stand: all things remain, in *statu quo*, just as they were. The leaders, preachers, and superintendent may go home as soon as they like." Now it has so happened, that for the author of the '*Observations*' to make such an attempt has become unnecessary, as the *Methodist Magazine* has done it for him, and against that authority it is supposed Mr. Welch will not appeal. The writer in the magazine says—"He (Mr. Welch) has fallen however into one error, in representing circuit stewards as so essentially constituent parts of a quarterly meeting, that their withdrawing would dissolve it."

ARTICLE IV.

REMARKS ON MR. GALLAND'S PAMPHLET.

This pamphlet is for the most part filled with a tissue of falsehoods or gross mis-representations—(not indeed the fabrications of Mr. Galland, the author believes he is incapable of it)—but arising out of the ill-will of one or two gossips, well known in the Methodist Society in Beverley, and whom Mr. Galland at that time was pre-disposed, from his irritated state of mind, to credit. He in consequence published their statements in that discreditable pamphlet. Neither the *Christian Guardian* nor the *Methodist Magazine* notice this pamphlet. As to its spirit, it would disgrace a heathen—and in point of composition, is miserable. Indeed, several of Mr. Galland's friends were sorry to see his name attached to such a production. Perhaps the best apology that can be made is, that it is understood he himself is sorry for having published it. It is true the *Christian Remembrancer*, (January 1826) does notice it as being the production of a preacher in the Connexion, but only to condemn it:—"Mr. Galland, throughout his pamphlet, does not attempt to deny the extravagant power which Mr. R. had pointed out, as belonging to the present system of Methodism. He is only busied in shewing that he has acted 'perfectly in order' in his own proceedings, the laws of Conference requiring him so to act; and that he has erred, if any where, on the side of 'peace and conciliation.' As to his mode of stating the facts in which he was implicated, we are unable to form any judgment, whether his description of the circumstance is more or less correct than that given by its 'class.' But it is plain, from both statements, (and it is all that it is material to the point) that the power of the Conference and its officers is *excessive*. 'You ought further to have known (says he) that our rules vest the regulation of all religious meetings in the superintendent. Did not your solemn engagements, then, to the Methodist public, implied in your assumption of the office of trustees, bind you to uphold me in my efforts to discharge my duty as a religious instructor in a chapel so settled, and in which Mr. R. even had he continued an acknowledged leader, requiring my sanction for the exercise of his functions?' What stronger illustration can Mr. R. want of the existence of that spiritual tyranny which he wishes to remove, than this very power of the superintendent."

It is certainly surprising to witness those who are very zealous whigs in politics, defending a religious system, which is founded on the most arbitrary principles. The writer, Mr. Atkinson, and Mr. John Shepherd heard Mr. Galland declare, that he himself heard the question discussed in Conference, "Whether or not a superintendent preacher should have the power to dismiss from the Society, any member, leader, steward or trustee, of his own accord, and that even in opposition to the wish of a trustee or leaders' meeting; and that it was determined, that a superintendent should have such a power to exercise on extra-

ordinary occasions, *he being the judge as to what cases should be considered extraordinary.* But he observed, that this did not arise out of any written law, but out of an agreement amongst the preachers. This makes the case all the worse, since the preachers can act on any law they please to make, and that without the people being aware that any such law exists. Nay, it appears, this private law is made to set aside a written law, whenever it is thought by the preachers to be expedient.

This declaration was made to the parties named above, when Mr. Galland met them to answer the '*Observations*,' but in which he seemed to fail; for the two local preachers, before whom he came, said, at the conclusion of the meeting, that they were more convinced of the truths contained in the '*Observations*' than ever. At a subsequent meeting of the trustees of the Beverley chapel, the writer asked Mr. Galland "if he had not made the above statement, to which he replied that he "had not 'in so many words.' Mr. A. Atkinson said, 'But, sir, you "told me some time ago, that if all the persons composing the Hull "meeting had voted in favour of Mr. Robinson's being retained a "member of the Society, the superintendent had power to dismiss "him.' Mr. Galland observed, that superintendents were to exercise "such a power only on extraordinary occasions. He said a case "occurred in his last circuit, (Lincoln) where a charge was brought "against a member, and several official persons were opposed to his "being dismissed; but, if all the quarterly meeting had been against "his being dismissed, he should have thought himself justified in putting "him out of the Society! He also acknowledged, that he had heard the "matter talked over in Conference, and that it was understood the "preachers should have the power alluded to. We are not, therefore, "left to the uncertainty of a mere opinion of Mr. Galland—that would "be of little consequence; but, unless he be as inaccurate as he was in "his report of our class, we learn this important fact, with which every "Methodist in England ought to be acquainted—That the Conference "has determined, that a superintendent preacher of a circuit can dismiss "any official or other member from the Society, at any time he pleases, "and that even in opposition to the vote of a whole meeting of his "equals to the contrary! One of the trustees observed, that as Mr. G. "professed to hold liberal political sentiments, he must have two opposite "sentiments in his mind at the same time."

The reader will doubtless be surprised that Mr. Galland, who has had a liberal education, and is a man of respectable talents, should have so far become a partizan of Conference, as to maintain what seems little less than real popery. Mr. Doncaster, one of the Hull preachers, had said, a short time before this, while meeting a class in Beverley, of which one member had been frequently absent—"Some "people will say that if we turn them out of the Methodist Society, "thank God, we cannot turn them out of heaven." He then, in a very "solemn manner, added—"I don't know that, there is more meaning in "that text of Scripture than many people think of—"Whatsoever ye "shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall "loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." This assertion was made in the hearing of about 20 members, from three of whom (and two of them are chapel stewards) the writer received the account.

When Mr. Galland met the two local preachers as before named, this extraordinary attempt, on the part of Mr. Doncaster, to intimidate the class and burthen their consciences, was named, he actually attempted to justify it, by observing—"When that note is freed from a little of its gloss, I believe the doctrine stated in it myself." The writer replied, "But what do you believe? Do you mean to say, that if a preacher turn any of our members out of the Society, he has power to exclude them from heaven?—Mr. G. I contend, that if one of our preachers dismiss from our Society a member who, having no religious scruples as to meeting in class, is yet negligent in meeting—though I do not say that I should say to such a person, you *cannot* enter heaven; yet I think I should be justified in asking "Do you *think* you can?"—Mr. R. Well, sir, you really surprise me. I know a person who has no scruple as to meeting in class, believing there is no harm in it; but conceiving that it is not a meeting of divine appointment, and therefore not properly speaking a means of grace, but of mere human institution, which they have not found very profitable to their own minds, has not been at all diligent in attendance on the class; and yet I sincerely believe that that person has gone on increasing in piety.—Mr. Shepherd. There was a friend of ours at the Woodmansey toll-bar, a local preacher, whom the travelling preachers employed very much to preach for them, who scarcely ever met in class.—To this Mr. G. made no reply." It may be observed, that if meeting in class be so necessary to salvation, one would imagine that the travelling preachers would set the example of being regular in meeting themselves; but we know that they will not meet in class at all, though in one circuit in the West-Riding great pains was taken to induce them to meet.

Those who wish to see a correct and pretty full account of Mr. Galland's violent and very unkind proceedings, are referred to the '*Address to the Methodist Societies, &c. by the Members of Mr. Robinson's Class,*' where they will see a detailed account of a conversation between Mr. Galland and the class; and that the report of what passed is here correctly given, may be presumed from the testimony of four trustees of the chapel:—"We were present in a trustee meeting, when "Mr. Galland was asked by Mr. Robinson if there was any thing "omitted in that account, and begged him to point it out, if there was "any thing wrong, but Mr. G. did not even attempt. Indeed, he had "said to one of us, that '*on the whole the Address contained a very fair* "account of the conversation.' He also said the same to Mr. Atkinson.

JOHN SHEPHERD
THOMAS BRIGHAM

JOHN HARRISON
G. C. TAYLOR."

If the writer is not misinformed, (and he believes he is not) Mr. Galland is the author of an illnatured letter, which lately appeared in the *Rockingham* newspaper, insinuating that the Methodists in this neighbourhood were at no loss to know who was the author of a paragraph in some or several of the newspapers, in which it was stated that the last Methodist Conference had appointed three travelling preachers as heads of the Methodist Church, with an Episcopal or overlooking power, and wishes his readers to believe that this is so absurd, as only to excite a smile among intelligent persons at all acquainted with the constitution and state of the Methodist Societies; and then goes on to

speak of the friendly feeling the Methodists have toward the Church. Mr. Galland could scarcely include himself in the number, as he said some time ago to a gentleman in Beverley, he considered the Evangelical Clergy the greatest enemies the Methodists have. The writer of these remarks never heard a word on the subject, nor saw a line respecting it, till after the account appeared in the newspapers, (and therefore, if Mr. Galland alluded to him, it is only another* of his rash, though very unjustifiable statements or insinuations) but certainly he did not think it at all improbable, and is only sorry Mr. Galland should be employed in attempting (whether designedly or not) to mislead his readers so much. Has not the Conference, at times, ever since Mr. Wesley's death, been attempting to introduce ordination, and when one of the preachers, lately in Hull, was asked whether it was *Presbyterian* or *Episcopal* ordination they were seeking, he replied, *Episcopal*; and this Mr. Galland must know is nothing new. If he need reminding, the writer would refer him to the following extracts from letters written by Methodist travelling preachers themselves:—

“London, 28th Dec. 1794.—I suspect Mr. M—— of having formed “the idea, long before Mr. Wesley's death. What else could have “induced him to get ordained, first, a *deacon*—secondly, a *priest*— “and thirdly, a *bishop*! Jonathan Crowther is to publish his thoughts on “the subject; and, if I am not mistaken, he will pinch some of them in “a tender part. I wish he may flog them till their bones are bare.

“JONATHAN EDMONDSON,

“*President of the late Conference, and now (1827) Chairman
“of the Bath District.*”

“—— And, beside, you ought to consider; how can you think that “the scheme of WANDERING BISHOPS is ever likely to succeed, if men “be suffered to write and resolve at this rate.

“JONATHAN CROWTHER,

“*Who lived and died a Methodist Travelling Preacher.*”

“Darlinton, 7th June, 1797.—Mr. M—— proposes the BISHOP “plan once more.

“J. RILEY, *Methodist Preacher.*”

Mr. Galland, there is no doubt, has seen the letters from which these extracts are made; and therefore his late attempt is the more cen-

* As so much misery is occasioned in the world by misrepresentation, and it is so difficult to detect the delinquents, it seems highly necessary to expose such instances, whenever we can clearly detect them, whether they have arisen from a malignant intention to injure others, or are the result of prejudice and party feeling. This insinuation in the newspaper is as untrue, and apparently as well meant, as was the following statement, relative to the writer's class, as given at page 45 of the “*Address from the Members of Mr. Robinson's Class.*”

As a gross misrepresentation has been made, relative to the class, it may be proper here to set the matter in its true light. Mr. Galland called on one of our friends at Hull, who is a trustee of the Beverley chapel, and represented to him, that Mr. R. had gone into the town, and brought into the class a number of persons who had no connexion with Methodism; and that, on going into the class, he found twenty-four persons were assembled! When the trustees were called together on the 17th, Mr. R. asked Mr. Galland, in the presence of this gentleman, whether he had not made such a representation? which Mr. G. could not deny: and the gentleman spoke aloud and said that Mr. G. had. Mr. G. said, Did I say twenty-four? The gentleman said, yes, you did; to which Mr. G. made no answer. Mr. R. then told the meeting, that, instead of there being twenty-four persons at the class, there were only thirteen and

surable. Is it possible that he can be ignorant either of a *private meeting*, held by several of the then leading Methodist preachers in Lichfield, for the purpose of having a few of themselves declared bishops, with this very same overlooking power? Need the writer remind him also of the use already made of this spurious episcopal ordination by the Conference? What says Mr. Crowther, one of the Conference, and an accredited historian of Methodism? That Dr. Coke, (who was only in deacon's orders when he became a Methodist preacher, and who never received any further *regular* ordination) assisted by others, ordained three missionaries who were preparing for Ceylon, before they left England.—(See certificate given by Dr. Coke, p. 53.)

As to sending representatives to Conference, Mr. Galland has been silent; recollecting, perhaps, what the writer once heard a friend of his say to him—"Thomas, you used to be as much for representation in Conference as any body, before you became a preacher; but since you have become a preacher yourself, you are as bad as any of them."

On the 13th September, 1824, a meeting was held at the Subscription Library-room, in Beverley, where an Address, signed by all the members of the class, was read over for the consideration of those present, when the following was agreed on unanimously:—

"*Resolved*, That the Address now read and signed by Mr. Robinson's class, be adopted and printed—

Mr. ROBERT SMELT

Mr. COLLINSON, of *Pocklington*

Mr. W. G. STATHER

Mr. W. HEWSON

Mr. G. C. TAYLOR

PRESENT,

Mr. J. HARRISON

Mr. W. CROSSKILL

Mr. P. DUNCAN

Mr. T. BRIGHAM

Mr. H. CALDER."

What these gentlemen thought of Mr. Galland's conduct, may be gathered from the following extract from the '*Address*':—"Review the whole affair:—Mr. R. consults with a number of pious and intelligent friends, on the propriety of attempting to remove certain evils in the system of Methodism—comes before the regular quarterly meeting of the circuit, to produce evidence, &c.—it is proposed and seconded that he be heard—the chairman refuses to allow any discussion upon it—refuses to read Mr. R.'s letter; but reads his own reply—urges that he is not chosen by that meeting to be chairman, but by Conference;

himself (the persons whose names are affixed to this address, and a person from Hull, who was on a visit to one of the members); and that of these, there was but one present on that Sunday for the first time, and he had been one of the oldest members of the class, but had left the class on account of what he believed to be an act of injustice toward a member of the Methodist Society in another circuit; that they were none of the remainder but who had met several times before they knew of Mr. Galland's design to interfere with the class:—so far was it from being true, that Mr. R. had gone into the town and brought persons into the class on this occasion who had no connexion with Methodism, and that twenty-four persons were assembled.—Making every allowance for the irritation of mind in which Mr. G. appeared before the class, it is really astonishing how he could make a statement so far from the truth. We would free Mr. G. from any intention to utter a deliberate falsehood—of that we believe him incapable; but the culpable haste, and apparent want of fairness, to give a calm, dispassionate report of what he had witnessed, must be charged upon him; and the clear detection of it will, it is to be hoped, make him more cautious in future.

After such an instance as this, and another for which Mr. Galland apologized, it is not surprising to see him at the same work again, though behind the screen of an anonymous name.

and therefore cannot allow the discussion of any thing of which he believes Conference would disapprove. Mr. R. is then strongly recommended by his friends to publish the letter—this letter is reviewed in the *Christian Guardian*, and declared to be written in such a manner, as that so far from doing harm, it must be productive of good; and that the arguments in it are incontrovertible—the president of the Conference writes to the superintendent, advising him to withhold Mr. R.'s quarterly ticket, and thereby dismiss him from the Society—Mr. Johnson withholds his ticket and class paper, and thus illegally dismisses him, and calls a number of leaders, &c. together, from different parts, passing by others—obtains a majority of them to sanction what he had done, (though several of them confessed they had not read the pamphlet, and it is believed that very few of them had)—the book was not allowed to be read in the meeting—not one thing was proved against Mr. R. but the publishing the pamphlet—he is refused a fair hearing, and is declared by the superintendent to be excluded from the Society—another meeting of local preachers, leaders, &c. is called, when it is resolved that the previous meeting was illegal, and that Mr. R. was refused a fair trial—this meeting is adjourned—various remonstrances are sent by the Beverley leaders, &c. to the superintendent and the Conference, but not one of them receives the least notice—Mr. Galland is sent down by Conference—states that the superintendent had power of his own accord to dismiss him; but being told that the deed of the Beverley chapel requires, that if any of the trustees (and Mr. R. is one) be dismissed from the Society, the consent of a majority of trustees must first be obtained—replies that Conference is above our chapel deed—says he can answer Mr. R.'s pamphlet in three hours satisfactorily—in the presence of two local preachers, is invited to discuss the matter with Mr. R.—fails in every point—publishes from the pulpit that he will meet the class lately met by Mr. R.—comes to the class accordingly, when the conversation takes place as already given.* What such unlimited power as this may grow to in time, we pretend not to determine; but this we can state, that we believe many of our friends in different circuits, view it with no small degree of concern. We may learn from the mottos affixed to Mr. R.'s pamphlet, that such power is both unreasonable and very dangerous.

“In this circuit, we hope, a temperate but firm stand will be made against such injustice as we have here referred to. We know one whole Society in the circuit, as well as many individuals in Hull and elsewhere, who will unite with us, in protesting against it; and we trust, their noble example will be followed by thousands of honest and independent Methodists throughout England.

“Mr. R. has no where expressed himself so strongly as some of our own preachers have done. He has not said, as Mr. Reynolds, one of the oldest preachers in the Connexion, did, in a sermon he preached at the late Conference at Leeds, “that he had considered the preachers as “a fallen body of men, since Mr. Wesley's death; and that many of “them had more seals to their watches, than seals to their ministry.” Nor has he any where, with Mr. D. Isaac, called the leading preachers

* See Address from the Class.

in Conference "Political negotiators," and threatened to expose them to Government. Nor, with Mr. Crowther, has he represented the Conference as a tumultuous meeting, where the preachers proceed to something beyond even the hardest words. Nor has he published any passage, which, in point of severity, will compare with the following extract from Mr. Bramwell's letter:—"When were we asked the state of our souls, since we were received into the Connexion? We may be proud, passionate, envious, malicious, covetous, self-willed, brawlers, and triflers—given to jesting—yea tiplers: we may oppose the real work of God; may turn hundreds out of the way; and yet remain travelling preachers." Now these preachers were never excluded, though they have expressed themselves so strongly: nay, even as to one of them, who published a book which the Conference objected to, it was contrived, we learn, to condemn the book and not the author. It has been said, that Mr. Galland is in a delicate situation. Had he been a poor man, with a large family, we confess there would have been some truth in it; and even then, a man of a truly pious, noble mind, would have abhorred the very idea of taking an unjust part against any one, to please the Conference; much more to do so to a person he had long regarded as a friend. On coming to this circuit, and learning that a subsequent meeting to the one held in the vestry of Waltham-street chapel, Hull, as already referred to, had determined unanimously that Mr. R. had been denied a fair trial, he would have written to the president of the Conference, and informed him, that having become acquainted with the real state of the case, he could not execute the orders of Conference without doing injustice, which he was determined not to do to any one; and especially to one he had long regarded as a friend. This would have been a praise-worthy and independent conduct. Instead of this, we are only furnished with another painful proof of the truth of the declaration, quoted by the late apostolic Vicar of Madeley, the Rev. Mr. Fletcher:—"How often do men sneakily forsake their friends, instead of gloriously supporting them, even when their cause is just; for reasons hastily prudent, for fear of giving umbrage to a superior party, or interest."

"For our own parts, we are determined to stand by any of our friends, who, to our apprehensions, may be unjustly treated. This, we think, is due to any man; especially to one who has been the leader of this class 14 years: and we should suspect ourselves to be wanting of common honesty, to assist any party in an act of oppression, which we feel assured in our own minds this is.

"We love peace as much as any men in the Connexion; but we should think it immoral, to purchase peace at the expense of truth and justice. From any member of our Societies, who would sacrifice justice to please the Conference, we have nothing to hope; but we are persuaded, that many of our friends will make this case their own, and consider the unjust expulsion of one member, as an offence committed against the whole body.

G. C. TAYLOR
WM. CROSSKILL
P. DUNCAN
WM. CROSS

WM. CAWKILL
JOHN ALMACK
THOS. BRUCE
JOHN HALL

WM. HARRISON
THOS. BRIGHAM
W. G. STATHER
ROBT. KEMP."

ARTICLE V.

REMARKS ON THE METHODIST MAGAZINE.

A very scurrilous review of the '*Observations*' and *Christian Guardian* appeared in the July and August Magazine, 1825, which was as coarse and unfeeling, as the mind from which it originated. The reviewer is evidently afraid of meeting the question, and therefore endeavours to lead the reader away from the main argument, by drawing his attention to what is both false in fact, and of no consequence had it been true. As the confined limits of this Appendix will not admit of any formal and circumstantial refutation of the flimsy arguments it contains, the writer will content himself for the present with noticing only two or three particulars, and giving a few extracts from those who have carefully read the review in question.

The *Christian Guardian*, or *Church of England Magazine*, for Sept. 1825, observes:—"Our attention is called to a review of various pamphlets on Methodism, inserted in the *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine* for July and August, which occupies no less than 19 pages; the chief object of which is to censure, in the strongest possible terms, the *Christian Guardian*, for inserting, in July, 1824, a favourable review of Mr. Mark Robinson's '*Observations on Methodism.*' We were perfectly aware that the conductors of the *Methodist Magazine* would be highly offended with Mr. Robinson's pamphlet, and with our review, and were quite prepared for some sudden burst of indignation; but we did not expect, that after a whole year's deliberation, so bitter, unchristian, and incorrect an article would have been sent forth to the world." After giving a general account of the assertions in the review, the *Guardian* goes on—"Now all these assertions are not only totally destitute of any evidence, but are absolutely and entirely untrue." (p. 350.) In the same work, for Nov. 1825, it is again remarked—"The last month's *Methodist Magazine* contains an article animadverting on the *Christian Guardian*, in the same lofty arrogant tone which distinguished their former observations on our review of Mr. Robinson's pamphlet. We shall not dwell upon the accusations of ignorance, incapacity, credulity, misrepresentation, &c. with which we are assailed. If our remarks had not contained solid truth, the Methodist reviewer would not so soon have lost temper." (p. 440.)

And what says Mr. Edmund Waller, of Wisbech, who has been quoted before? He is one of their own local preachers:—"That Mr. Robinson has produced certain passages of scripture, to shew that the power of the Conference, according to the 7th article, is contrary to the gospel privileges of our Societies, is a fact; and it is equally true, that Mr. Sandwith and his reviewer (in the *Methodist Magazine* for July and August, 1825) have overlooked those passages of scripture in a way which is no credit to themselves, or the cause they profess to advocate: and whoever reads their laboured performances, with the New Testament in their hands, for the purpose of obtaining satisfactory information on this subject, will rise from the

“perusal disappointed, if not disgusted. The author wishes to be understood, that he advocates Mr. Robinson’s cause no further than it is supported by divine authority, and connected with the scriptural reform of our Church Government, as it now stands; yet he thinks that Mr. Robinson’s arguments on this point remained unanswered; and that Mr. Sandwith’s pop-gun, and that of his reviewer, are neither primed or loaded from the magazine of divine truth. It may be necessary for the author to observe, that some allusions are made in the following pages to the review of Mr. Robinson’s ‘*Observations*,’ as contained in the *Methodist Magazine* for July and August, 1825; and he would remind THAT MAN OF COMMON ABUSE, from whose forked tongue the poison of slander has been thrown, from one end of the world to the other, that the passages of scripture, contained in the appendix, will rasp down all the viper’s teeth: for whoever expects to find a ‘thus saith the Lord’ in the laboured performance of this reviewer, will be disappointed, and constrained to acknowledge that, like the wizards of old, he does but ‘peep and mutter.’ ”*

When one of their own local preachers is compelled to make such a charge against the *Magazine*, what can be said, but that we would hope that the next time they write on this subject, they will shew some degree of the “meekness of wisdom,” and remember that “the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God.” But the reviewer is in such breathless haste to justify the Conference, that he even sacrifices Mr. Wesley himself. No two individuals, indeed, can be more opposed to each other than the reviewer and Mr. Wesley. In another equally angry article in the October number, the reviewer professes to advert to what the *Guardian* has not said, and to what it has said “to its silence and its sayings.” It may not be amiss to adopt the same mode, and ask the reviewer a few questions at any rate, on the first division—his silence. But before the writer does this, he would just ask the reviewer, how he could, with any regard to truth, write the following:—“This periodical has attempted something like a reply to the strictures in our numbers for July and August, upon the conduct of its review; but it is such a reply as passes over in total silence all the leading points of our crimination—points which its character required that it should either explain, or confess. It has done neither, and therefore pleads guilty, by this very omission, to the justice of our complaints.”

The *Guardian* for the following month, Nov. 1825, must have made the reviewer ashamed of himself, by a very brief reply—“They attack us, in the first place, for having passed over in silence many of their former assertions; and contend that such silence is a tacit admission of the truth of their accusations. Now what is the fact? The Wesleyan Magazine had employed nineteen pages in animadverting on a review, which, together with the extracts, occupied only six of ours. These animadversions contained much irrelevant matter, and we therefore confined our reply to the leading points, introducing the last paragraph with the remark, ‘It were easy to enlarge upon various topics, but both time and space compel us to close: we must, therefore, content ourselves with simply denying the remaining charges’

* See ‘*Waller’s Remarks on Mr. Sandwith’s Apology*,’ p. 1 & 2, preface.

"*brought against us in the Wesleyan Magazine.*" It required some hardi-
 hood to charge us with tacitly confessing what we thus expressly denied."

1. How is it the reviewer does not say one word respecting the "lot" which was cast in Conference after Mr. Wesley's death, to know whether the Methodist preachers had any scriptural right to give the sacraments to the Societies or not, and which lot so fell that the preachers were not to give the sacraments? Perhaps a re-print of a note on the subject may remind the reviewer, and lead him again to turn to the preface of the 2nd edition of the '*Observations*,' which was printed long before he wrote his articles in the *Magazine*. He may also turn for a more full account, to the '*Address from the Members of Mr. Robinson's Class*.'

"But did the Conference so late as 1792, really endeavour to keep the Societies in union with the Church of England? Let the reader judge, when he has perused the following most extraordinary address.

"To the Members of our Societies, who desire to receive the Lord's supper from the hands of their own preachers.

"VERY DEAR BRETHREN,

"The Conference desire us to write to you, in their name, in the
 "most tender and affectionate manner, and to inform you of the event of
 "their deliberations concerning the administration of the Lord's supper.
 "After debating the subject time after time, we were greatly divided in
 "sentiment. In short we knew not what to do, that peace and union
 "might be preserved. At last one of the senior brethren (Mr. Pawson)
 "proposed that we should commit the matter to God by putting the ques-
 "tion to the lot, considering that the Oracles of God declare, that "the
 "lot causeth contentions to cease, and parteth between the mighty."
 "And again, "that the lot is cast into the lap, but the whole disposing
 "thereof is of the Lord." And considering also that we have the ex-
 "ample of the Apostles themselves, in a matter, which we thought, all
 "things considered, of less importance. We accordingly prepared the
 "lots; and four of us prayed. God was surely then present, yea, his
 "glory filled the room. Almost all the preachers were in tears, and, as
 "they afterwards confessed, felt an undoubted assurance that God himself
 "would decide. Mr. Adam Clarke was then called on to draw the lot,
 "which was, "You shall not administer the sacrament the ensuing year."
 "All were satisfied. All submitted. All was peace. Every countenance
 "seemed to testify that every heart said, "It is the Lord, let him do what
 "seemeth him good." A minute was then formed according to the
 "previous explanation of the lots, that the sacrament should not be ad-
 "ministered in our Connexion, for the ensuing year, except in London.
 "The prohibition reaches the Clergy of the Church of England, as well
 "as the other brethren. We do assure you, dear brethren, we should
 "have been perfectly resigned, if the lot had fallen on the other side.
 "Yea, we should, as far as Christian prudence and expediency would
 "have justified, have encouraged the administration of the Lord's supper
 "by the preachers; because we had not a doubt but God was uncom-
 "monly present on the occasion, and did himself decide.

"Signed, in behalf of the Conference,

"ALEXANDER MATHER, *President.*

"*London, July, 1792.*

"THOMAS COKE, *Secretary.*"

"It is clear from what has been stated, that Mr. R. and his friends contend for nothing but what many of the Conference preachers advocated a few years ago (for representation in Conference is the only immediate measure for which they contend); and as those preachers never were dismissed from the Connexion, we cannot perceive the justice or wisdom of dismissing Mr. R. and those who think with him. But if even they had pressed the Society to adopt *immediate* measures for a return to Church Methodism (the Methodism of Mr. Wesley), where would have been the harm? Are they not told by the Conference, that, in 1792, it was revealed from heaven, that the Methodist preachers should not give the sacrament to their Societies? If we could be credulous enough to believe, that a new revelation or a divine decision was made on this occasion, it would only strengthen our opinions; but when we consider, that the leading preachers in Conference were at this time Church Methodists themselves, and very desirous that the Societies should believe that it was their duty to remain in union with the Church of England, a new revelation looks very suspicious. To us it seems surprising, how the Conference durst ask for a special decision from heaven, during a period which they themselves fixed, and then publish to the world, that God himself did decide that they should not give the sacrament the ensuing year. Most pious and judicious readers will, we think, be astonished at the presumption of Conference, when they consider,—1. That they ask the Almighty to determine, whether or not they ought to give the sacrament to their Societies, when they were in possession of the revealed will of God, the sacred Scriptures, which we suppose they would allow to be the only rule, to which either private Christians or Christian Societies are called on to conform. 2. That they limit the time during which they will venture to allow even the divine Being himself, to determine for them in this affair, "the ensuing year." 3. That on the lot falling so as to forbid them giving the sacrament to the Societies, they should immediately make an exception with regard to London. They will also observe that the Conference wished the Connexion to believe that the Almighty was specially present on the occasion, "*and did himself decide*" in favour of Church Methodism. How comes it to pass, then, that after such a clear decision was obtained, the Conference ever ventured to give the sacrament without a counter order? We believe they never ventured to put this matter to lot again! One would suspect that they grew sceptical as to the decision being divine, if they ever believed it; and what seems equally extraordinary is, that they should now dismiss from their Society, those who have been guilty of nothing but contending for the very measures, which the Conference declared, in 1792, they were directed by God himself to adopt; and for advocating the advantage of a representative form of government in the Connexion, though many of the Conference preachers contended for the same, as late as 1797."*

2. Why has the reviewer passed by all the mottos in silence, especially the one from Mr. Watson, in which he speaks of the *radical* defect of the

* See '*Address from the Members of Mr. Robinson's Class*,' page 26. What can be the reason that neither Mr. Sandwith, nor Mr. Galland, nor Mr. Welch, nor the writer in the *Methodist Magazine*, has noticed this part of the '*Address*'? Some persons have supposed it is because they cannot answer it.

present system of Methodism, (see introduction to the foregoing Letter)—or that of Dr. Coke, who says “the preachers have all the power, the people none”—or that of the *Christian Observer*, “that the constitution of the Conference leads to *the secret chambers of the inquisition itself*”?

3. Why is no explanation given of the preachers’ fund? Let any one turn to the remarks on the fund in the 2nd edition of the ‘*Observations on Methodism*,’ and to those made by the reviewer, (page 536 in the *Methodist Magazine* for August, 1825,) and say whether those who have been made to contribute ten thousand pounds without either their knowledge or consent (as it was subscribed to another fund, but put by the preachers into their own *private* fund) have not a right to know what there is in that fund? Instead of calling those who enquire “wicked” or “ignorant,” the reviewer had much better have ingenuously explained it. Did not Mr. Bunting, in open Conference, recommend that the fund should no longer be kept private? Indeed how could he approve of the preachers never bringing the balances of the “merciful fund” forward from year to year, but putting them into *their own private fund*, and then calling on the people to contribute to the merciful fund, telling them it was quite exhausted? It was of course like to be exhausted, when the preachers had put the balances from year to year (which were annually from £300. to £1,700.) into their own private fund! Neither the author of the ‘*Observations*,’ nor his friends, contributed to the preachers grudgingly, nor wished their stipends to be lessened; tho’ they could not but highly disapprove of the apparently deceptive means used by *some* of the preachers to obtain money, and the general reply of all the preachers, that “the people had no right to know what there is in the fund.” The writer remembers one travelling preacher observing (who as matter of course was one of those interested in the fund, as being a member) “that he never would defend it; that it was an unhappy thing that the private fund was ever made—that it originated in a distrust of the continued liberality of the people.”

4. Perhaps the reviewer could have found another fund, kept private, besides the preachers’ *private* fund, if he had happened to think of the book-room. Who, except the preachers, know what the book-room produces every year? This was the concern which Thomas Thompson, esq. of Hull, and many others, contended at Leeds, in 1797, ought to be put, in part at least, under the management of representatives from the Societies.

5. We have no explanation of the Lichfield meeting. The reviewer, perhaps, could have informed us to what kind of “ordination” and “overlooking power” was sought for then, which was just after Mr. Wesley’s death.—(See ordination treated on in this Appendix, p.53)

6. We are not told whether Mr. Galland was correct, when he informed his friends what he once heard in Conference, respecting the immense and uncontrollable power of superintendent preachers, (see this Appendix, page 64) and whether he only claimed a very moderate share of power when he modestly declared, “That once when a member “had to be tried by a quarterly meeting at Lincoln, he should have “turned him out of Society, though all the quarterly meeting” (and there would doubtless in a body of perhaps 30 or 40, be not less than

ten men who could render a reason) "had voted in favour of his being retained a member." (See this Appendix, page 65.)

7. The reviewer has omitted to inform his readers how to reconcile a few things, which appear to plain understandings somewhat difficult. The Methodist preachers, in Conference assembled, are very friendly to the Church of England; yet one of their own body writes a book against the Church, which their apologist, Mr. H. Sandwith, calls "rancorous," and is indeed so "wicked and blasphemous," the author of it informs us that Mr. Bunting dare not read it aloud; and yet the author (Mr. Isaac) is retained, nay even said, when the Conference tried the *book* in his absence, to be blameless, all the evil being charged on the *book*!!! The reviewer does not forget to tell that the Dissenters absent themselves from Church upon principle, &c. but we hear nothing of one of the Conference (and one of the most intelligent and popular men in the Connexion) publishing and selling in the Societies, a book containing those very dissenting principles.—Mr. Isaac's own account of the affair is so much in character, that had the writer room, he should have been glad to have given the whole letter.

"There is one point of importance, however, which I can clear up, and I hope in a way quite satisfactory to the public. Those who reflect, that about 200 holy men of God, after careful examination and solemn debate, had felt it a public duty, in the fear of God, to express their decided disapprobation of a book, will naturally conclude that the poor heretical author has been roughly handled. They will perhaps be simple enough to think, that the general spirit of a book must contain the spirit of the author, and consequently that it could not be *unchristian*, and he altogether christian: they may conclude, that if the book deserved a *public censure*, he would certainly receive a private monition. For the information of those who are not such adepts in metaphysical science as the Conference orators, I think it important to state the fact, that tho' the little urchin exhibits my sentiments, has imbibed my spirit, and bears my image as well as my superscription, the Conference did not attribute the slightest blame to ME. If any one should be too dull to perceive the consistency of this, I will enlighten him in the words of a preacher, who wrote me from Conference—"It was distinctly stated that the question was not Mr. Isaac, but Mr. Isaac's book." He remarks further in the same letter—"I do not believe that any one brother entertains any sentiment towards you contrary to esteem and affection." The reason of the distinction between me and my book being so particularly stated, was this—Some of my friends, full of old fashioned notions, thought my character was implicated in the censure of my book, and particularly when they considered the grounds on which it was urged the censure ought not to be published, which will be explained by and bye; they therefore moved that I should be sent for, and have the privilege of speaking for myself. Their mistake was immediately corrected, and they were taught to discriminate between a writer and his work. It was freely admitted, that had my character been attacked the motion was proper; but it was contended, that this was not a question of character, no one proposing any objections against brother Isaac; the point to be discussed was not *him*, but his *book*. If any should

“still doubt, I can solemnly assure the incredulous, that the Conference has not in any way signified the slightest objection to my conduct. Besides, if the reader will take the trouble of looking into the stations, he will perceive that I am not only continued as a preacher, but have the honour of superintending the Lincoln circuit. I am highly delighted with the doctrine that an author is not responsible for his productions; and that however deserving they may be of reprobation, no blame whatever attaches to him. The whole tribe of scribblers may now dash away as hard as they please, they have no personal consequence to dread. I presume authors are somewhat like sovereigns: there may be serious faults in a government, but the king can do no wrong. So that there may be a great deal of wickedness in a book, but the writer has done nothing amiss.” *

We learn however in the sequel, from this facetious and ingenious writer, Mr. Isaac, that many of the preachers approved of the *principles* of his book, but objected merely to his *style* and *spirit*; and that they put the protest against his book into their *Minutes*, to be beforehand with the *Christian Observer* and *Eclectic Review*. †

These seven enquiries might be multiplied, had the writer time and opportunity to pursue the subject; but he must conclude with a very brief notice of two leading particulars noticed by the reviewer, and repeated by him and the writer of the *Minutes of Conference* again and again.

1. They would fain persuade their readers, that nothing but “ignorance” or “wickedness” could lead any man to argue that the Methodist system can be an arbitrary one, so long as the Methodist Connexion remains a *voluntary* one, whose preachers are supported by voluntary subscriptions, and whose Members can leave at pleasure. Now if this argument (which the writer is surprised to find Mr. Bunting using in the *Minutes*, and the reviewer in the *Magazine*) be worth any thing, then from this time let us hear no more of the system of Popery being an arbitrary one in any Protestant part of the world. In Ireland, for instance, for there the Catholic Clergy are supported by the *voluntary contributions* of their people; and any Catholic can leave that Church when he pleases. Shall we then in future be afraid to call Popery an arbitrary and unscriptural system, because in so doing we reproach the system of Methodism, *both* being systems supported by *voluntary* contributions, and which therefore, according to Mr. Bunting and the Methodist reviewer, cannot be arbitrary!

2. The reviewer affects to chastise the *Christian Guardian*, for in effect saying that “the preachers were the principal cause of the sacraments being given by them in their own chapels to the people,”—and he becomes very abusive, telling the editor of the *Guardian* how ignorant he must be to make such an assertion, and that he ought to have read, in order to inform himself. Suppose, then, this “ignorant reviewer” in the *Christian Guardian*, (who, judging from his work, knows Methodism as well as the Methodist reviewer, and writes upon it much more like a Christian) had chanced to open a volume of Mr. Wesley’s life, written by Mr. Wesley’s own particular friend, who preached his funeral sermon, Dr. Whitehead, what else could he have thought?

* † See ‘*Letter to Superintending Preachers*,’ by Mr. D. Isaac, Methodist preacher.

“The first and leading principle in the economy of Methodism, from its commencement to the present time, was not to form the people into a separate party; but to leave every individual member of the Society at full liberty to continue in his former religious connexion: nay, leaving every one under a kind of necessity of doing so, for the ordinance of baptism and the Lord’s supper. Having established their Societies on this principle, the Methodists became a kind of middle link between all the religious parties in the nation, gently drawing them nearer together by uniting them all in the interests of experimental religion and scriptural holiness. They formed a kind of central point, from which the rays of gospel light issued forth, not in one direction alone, to eradicate only one point of their circumference, but in all directions, equally enlightening every part of their periphery. BUT TWO OR THREE OF THE PREACHERS, who had acquired some influence with the people, had for some time been dissatisfied with this middle situation; the being no party, but standing in an equal relation to all, *as fellow-helpers to the truth*. WE MAY OBSERVE, THAT THIS DISSATISFACTION ORIGINATED WITH A FEW AMBITIOUS PREACHERS, and from them spread, like a contagious disease, to the people. This was the case at first, and has always been the case since, wherever the people have desired any alteration in the original constitution of the Methodist Societies. The method of proceeding, even to the present time, to effect their purpose, is rather curious, and shews to what wretched means men will sometimes resort, to support a bad cause. For as soon as these preachers had by various arts, influenced a few persons in any Society to desire to receive the Lord’s supper from them, they pleaded this circumstance as a reason why the innovation should take place; pretending they only wished to satisfy the desires of the people, not their own restless ambition. As a vast majority in these Societies were members of the Church of England, so the forming of the Methodists into a separate party, was called a separating them from the Church; though it evidently implied a change in their relative situation to all denominations of Dissenters, as much as to the Church. The clamour, however, for a separation from the Church, had been raised so high by a few of the preachers, that the subject was fully discussed for two or three days together, at this Conference; and Mr. Wesley observes, “My brother and I closed the Conference by a solemn declaration of our *purpose never to separate from the Church.*”

So again in his ‘*Life of the Rev. Charles Wesley*,’ Dr. Whitehead observes—“The number of lay preachers was now greatly increased; and though very few of them had enjoyed the benefits of a learned, or even a good education in the common branches of knowledge, yet there were among them men of strong sense, and great powers of mind, who soon became useful and able preachers of the gospel.—We may naturally suppose, that these, conscious of their abilities and usefulness, would begin to feel some uneasiness under the very humble character of a Methodist preacher, which the public at that time held in great contempt. This seems to have been actually the case; for they wished to promote a plan, which no doubt they hoped might both be useful to the people, and give them a greater degree

“of respectability in the public opinion. To accomplish this purpose, they were desirous that the preachers, or some of them at least, should have some kind of ordination, and be allowed to administer the ordinances to the people, through all the Societies. Both Mr. John and Charles Wesley opposed this attempt, as a total dereliction of the avowed principles on which the Societies were first united together. When they became itinerant preachers, and began to form Societies, they utterly disclaimed any intention of making a separate party in the nation: they never intended that the Societies should be separate churches: the members were constantly exhorted to attend their respective places of worship.—He seemed to expect, that when he and his brother were removed hence, troubles would arise in the Societies; but that, after various struggles, a third part would be found to adhere to their ORIGINAL CALLING, and to the original simplicity of the Methodists.”

But what says Mr. William Stewart, one of the Methodist reviewer's own friends, a travelling preacher at this moment in the Conference Methodist Connexion? Speaking of the introduction of the sacrament into the Methodist Societies in Ireland, he says—“After all, I am forced to think, although the wishes and demands of the people are made the *plea*, the principles and desires of the preachers constitute the primary and chief *cause*. The petitions to Conference for it have been very *partial*, and never half so many as those that have been against it. *And be it well remembered, there never was a petition presented for it at the Conference board, from any circuit but where preachers favourable to the measure were stationed at the time.*”

It will, perhaps, be replied, that this is the statement of but one preacher; and that however well he knew the Conference and the Connexion, he might be mistaken. But what will the reader say, on being informed that the four travelling preachers in the Dublin circuit were of the same opinion, though they also continue members of the Conference? This appears from the following memorandum accompanying the letter:—

“N. B. The above letter has been written at our request, and we most cordially approve and recommend the sentiments it contains.

“WILLIAM FERGUSON.

ANDREW HAMILTON.

“JOHN KERR.

WILLIAM REILLY.”

And what says Mr. M'Afee, who has re-joined the Conference Connexion? Why, that the principal reason for which he left the Conference Connexion and joined the Primitive Wesleyan Methodists a few years ago, was, that he saw a number of Methodist travelling preachers assembling to walk in procession to one of the Established Churches in Dublin, to receive the sacrament; and that on enquiring of one of the preachers why they were about to do so, he was given to understand, *that it was merely to keep up the appearance of attachment to the Church!* This Mr. M'Afee stated both in public and private.—The *Christian Guardian*, then, may surely be excused, having only advanced what the Methodist preachers have already published; but as to the Methodist reviewer, the charge of “ignorance” recoils upon himself, or he must be in a still worse predicament. There is one most extraordinary piece of conduct in the Methodist reviewer,—Mr. Wesley,

all his life, was most anxious that the Clergy of the Established Church should be convinced that Methodism (the Church Methodism of his day) was eminently calculated to promote the interests of Christianity in general, and those of the Church of England in particular: hence his frequent application to the higher order of Clergy, (to the Bishops especially) for their countenance. The Methodist preachers at times profess the same attachment to the Church; but it appears that they are now becoming apprehensive that those professions will be very cautiously received by Churchmen, and fearing that the countenance afforded to Church Methodism, both by the Clergy and Laity, should enable it to spread through the country, they actually allow their *Magazine* to become the vehicle of an article in direct opposition to Mr. Wesley's and their own former professions; and seeing that there is no hope that the Church of England will regard them as friendly to its interests, while they pursue their present plans, they seem to have ardently wished that the Clergy should form an unfriendly opinion of Methodism altogether, both primitive and modern, rather than countenance Church Methodism: for the reviewer says, that the Clergy would determine wisely in having nothing to do with "Primitive Methodism," such as they say it was originally. Much as Mr. Wesley feared that, after he was gone, many of his Societies would leave the Church, yet he never seems to have anticipated that the time would come when even his preachers would publicly tell the Clergy of the Church of England, that though on the plan of Primitive Methodism, "as many of the members as could be persuaded would receive the "sacrament at the Church," and the "service in Church hours would be given up, yet that still any clergyman would determine wisely in "having nothing to do with it!" The fact was, the grapes were sour. The preachers having found that the Church of England could not be prevailed on to countenance the proceedings of the Conference, (and how should it, when they are in direct opposition to its own interests?) they seem to have determined on preventing any friendly union between the Church and Church Methodism: in effect saying to the Church Methodists, if the Clergy and leading members of the Establishment will not recognise us as worthy their countenance, we will do all in our power to persuade them that Methodism in any form, however allied to the Church, is not worthy their regard; thus at once disowning and gainsaying all the early professions of Methodism, giving the lie to the solemn declarations of Messrs. Wesleys' & Fletcher, and indeed placing their own sincerity in a most questionable shape.

Yet Mr. Galland, with all his whig principles, &c. and conviction that "the evangelical Clergy are the greatest enemies the Methodists have," affects to assure his readers, that if the higher order of Clergy should be found giving the cause of Church Methodism the greatest possible assistance, both by their countenance and contributions, it "would be hailed by the Methodist Connexion as the most important "recognition of the great features and characteristics of Methodism, and "soon published by them with glad acclamations throughout all the land "in the length thereof and in the breadth thereof." * How far this

* See 'Mr. Galland's Letter to Messrs A. Atkinson, &c.' p. 4.

strange declaration can be reconciled with the bitter feeling Mr. Galland has manifested toward this very Church Methodism, which he professes he should, with his brethren, be so glad to see publicly supported by the Clergy, the writer must leave his readers to determine. It certainly affords another proof of the correctness of a remark made to Mr. Galland, by a friend of his in a trustee meeting, that he seemed to have "*two opposite sentiments in his mind at the same time.*" (See this Appendix, page 65.)

On the subject of a representative system, the Methodist reviewer has said very little, and as little to the purpose, relying chiefly on the assumed fact that the people are content to be shut out of Conference. This, however, is most undoubtedly untrue; every one knows, who is well acquainted with the sentiments of the principal Methodists in England, that there is a very general dissatisfaction on the subject throughout the kingdom. In America, this is still more strongly felt: indeed such is the impression made upon the Connexion there, that even great numbers of the Methodist travelling preachers are for the measure. The writer knows, from undoubted authority, that at the last Philadelphia Conference there was a large majority of travelling preachers in favour of lay representation. But there is the same artful contrivance in the constitution of the American system of Methodism, as there is in the British one. No subject can ever be *discussed* in the general Conference, unless *all* the provincial Conferences are agreed to request it! This seems almost equal to the famous arrangement on this side the Atlantic, which provides that if any law, made by the preachers in Conference, is disapproved of by the Societies, a quarterly meeting can set it aside: which, considering that these meetings are composed chiefly of leaders, stewards, and local preachers, (there only being a few travelling preachers in them) seems at first sight to give the people a fair share of power, perhaps an unequal one. But the reader must have the mystery solved, and then he will see how admirable is the contrivance. 1. The quarterly meetings are held so immediately after the Conference, that there is not sufficient time for the *Minutes of Conference* to circulate before the leaders, &c. assemble; and it is only at the *first* quarterly meeting the subject can be discussed. 2. The law of Conference cannot be set aside, unless there be (the writer quotes the words of the rule) "*a major-part of the meeting in conjunction with the preachers,*" so that, if but *one* travelling preacher object, the unanimous vote of all the rest would be useless! 3. If even the travelling preachers thought it good policy in any instance to vote with the other part of the meeting, the law would only be thereby set aside in that circuit, and but for *one* year, for if the law be confirmed by the second Conference, it is no more subject to discussion at a quarterly meeting!

On this law the *Christian Guardian* very properly remarks—"No candid interpretation of the previous parts of the law, can leave it doubtful that the real intention of the whole law was, to secure all power virtually to the preachers."

The Methodist reviewer, (not finding it convenient to shew what other meaning this law has, than the one assigned to it by the writer, the *Christian Guardian*, the *Christian Remembrancer*, and Mr. Edmund

Waller, one of their own local preachers,) has contented himself with calling names and being abusive, and tacitly denies that it has the meaning we affix to it. However, while he was at the work of abuse, and quite ready with the application of the terms "silly," "gross perversion," "blind confidence," "ignorance," "dishonourable cavil," "quibbling," &c. &c. &c. as applicable to the writer and the *Christian Guardian*, how is it that he never scolds Mr. Crowther, the accredited historian of Methodism, for having given the same sense as the writer and the *Christian Guardian* have of this deceptive law? Mr. Crowther shews not only that the preachers must be members of the quarterly meeting, *but that they must give their consent*, before any new law made by the Conference can be set aside.

"Any new rule (says he) made to bind the Societies at large, IF 'objected to at the NEXT quarterly meeting of any circuit, THE MAJOR-PART PRESENT, AND ALSO THE PREACHERS, THINKING THAT THE 'OBSERVANCE OF SUCH RULE WOULD BE INJURIOUS TO THAT CIRCUIT, 'IT SHALL NOT BE ENFORCED THAT YEAR. But should a second Conference confirm the rule, it will then be binding upon the whole 'Connexion.'—(See '*Crowther's Portraiture of Methodism*,' p. 313.)

If Mr. Crowther, then, be correct, on whom is the charge of quibbling to be fixed? It is believed, by many of the more intelligent Methodists, that the time is not distant when a vigorous effort will be made by the people to be heard within Conference, and that the preachers will in the longrun be unable to deny them this christian, reasonable, and constitutional right. When Mr. Richard Watson, the present President of the Conference, was a preacher in the New Connexion, (founded by the late Mr. Alexander Kilham,) we find him Secretary of their Conference, and speaking in terms of warm approbation of the system of lay delegation, the benefits of which he can doubtless yet describe.

"The peace and unanimity which have prevailed amongst us during 'the whole of our sitting; the earnest desire to be more extensively 'useful, which the whole body of preachers and delegates have manifested; that freedom from undue local attachments, and the hearty 'co-operation of each for the benefit of the whole; as they have 'afforded additional proof of the excellence of that liberal constitution we have formed, have likewise given us so many pledges of 'future success, and opened before us the most encouraging prospects."

So again, in the following year, we find him as Secretary, and Mr. Oakes as President to the Conference, addressing the people as follows:—

"Near eleven years have elapsed since, from the best motives of 'supporting the honour of Christ in his Church, we united in *such a 'system of Church government* as appeared to us best adapted to promote 'that union and reciprocal confidence *which are so essential to the 'interest and character of Christianity*. Since that time, you have witnessed the trials and difficulties we have had to encounter; and also 'through the divine mercy, as often have been called to mark with 'gratitude, the operation of His hand, who leads the people through the 'cloud and through the sea, and who to the present time hath both 'helped and blessed us.'—(See '*New Methodist Magazine*.')

The writer takes it for granted, that his readers know that the New Methodist Connexion is governed by a yearly Conference, composed of travelling preachers and lay representatives from their quarterly meetings; not occupying two separate chapels, as the Church Methodists propose, but like the Primitive Wesleyan Methodists of Ireland, and the Primitive Methodists (or Ranters) in England.

Three years after Mr. Watson addressed the New Methodist Connexion as above, (and when of course he had had other three years' trial of the plan,) we find him once more the Secretary of their Conference, and addressing the whole Connexion in the following very animated manner. It fully shews his opinion of a system of lay representation.

"Having therefore, as a matter of conscience, seriously united together, on a *liberal plan, which is characterised by a beautiful simplicity, and founded on scripture*, lend it all your support. Whatever instability may have appeared in preachers, or others, still our cause, like a mighty bulwark, stands immovably secure. The fairness and publicity of our system, *as it is founded on the maxims of our Saviour, will*, when ultimately considered, commend itself to every man's conscience in the sight of God. In an establishment like ours, difficulties of considerable magnitude ought reasonably to have been anticipated, and St. Paul's advice should have been inscribed on every minister's heart, who publicly stood forth in defence of our Zion: "Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit yourselves like men, be strong." We would hope that, by this time, you are sensible of the great importance of a generous, open, and scriptural plan prevailing in the Church of God.

"To have once taken a jealous and active part in our cause, and then to shrink from that useful and manly zeal which you formerly displayed, would doubtless to you be a reproach. We hope never to see you lukewarm in your salvation, and we certainly shall be deeply affected to behold you insensible to the general good of our Connexion. We would therefore call upon you, in the name of our God, to cause all the energies of your soul to assist us in promoting vital religion. It may appear too much like boasting for us to say, that THE PREACHERS and DELEGATES at the Chester Conference were very much united, and that all our affairs have been conducted with great harmony and affection. Yet, why not publish a truth so gratifying to your feelings?"—(See '*New Methodist Magazine*.')

There is another subject worthy of notice. It is what relates to the missionary fund. It is somewhat singular that the reviewer should not once refer to it. The Primitive Wesleyan Methodists of Ireland have published the following account.

"In the *Annual Report* of the committee for the management of the missions under the direction of the Methodist Conference, printed London, 1816, page 30, we read, 'The public will perceive, that according to the resolution of the last Conference, the missionary fund has been applied solely to *Foreign objects*, with the exception of 'a sum voted by the committee toward the expenses of the mission in 'the Irish language;' and page 31, 'The committee wish it to be understood, that its aid has been extended only to the six *Irish missionaries who preach in the native language, and for that reason*

“only. And the committee have thought proper to fix their annual allowance at £370. for the whole number.”

“In the *Minutes of Conference*, Dublin, July 1818, we find twenty-one names set down as *Irish Missionaries*. Quere, are there twenty-one preachers in the Conference, capable of preaching sermons in the Irish language? Or, what superior good could be effected by them, if they did attempt it? Little, if any, in the opinion of some of the most intelligent members of Conference. But they find it a convenient part of their system. Of the above twenty-one, several are supported out of the general missionary fund, by a considerable grant of money, nearly equal to £800. Irish currency, who in fact are not real missionaries. Can the Wicklow missionary preach in the native language? Or, could a congregation be collected in Wicklow, capable of understanding him, if he did? Wicklow is a Protestant county, crowded with many of the most fashionable and opulent residents in Ireland. Some of the twenty-one, we believe, are quite inadequate to the task of preaching in Irish. But what shall we say to the Derry and Antrim missionaries? ‘*Brother Thomas Kerr is appointed to solicit aid from our friends throughout Ireland, for the recovery of our chapels.*’ And we know, that G. Ouseley has been travelling over the united Kingdom collecting money. Is this preaching in ‘the dark parts of Ireland in the native language,’ so justly considered by the committee as the only reason sufficient to apologize for bringing the expenses incurred upon the *foreign fund*?”—(See *Conference Reviewed*.)

Perhaps the reviewer will favour his readers with an explanation, through the medium of the *Magazine*, (and the writer hopes in better temper than before) how he meets all this. The writer wishes he had had room, and sufficient opportunity, for publishing a regular answer to this article in the *Magazine*; for there is not one argument he has used in any way disproved, nor one fact shewn to be false. It is a mere attempt to create a bad feeling against the writer and the *Christian Guardian*, and to disprove what they have advanced, by indirectly denying it. The Methodist reviewer, there is too much reason to fear, is one of those preachers described by Dr. Whitehead, in his ‘*Life of Mr. Wesley*,’ vol. ii. p. 374.

“I am sorry to confess, that there are men among the preachers, of a most violent ungovernable spirit. These, if they find it necessary for any particular purpose, to oppose an individual, or any number of individuals, of character and influence in the Society, use every method in their power, BOTH IN THE PULPIT and out, to make him appear to the people as bad as the devil. Invention is on the rack to put the worst construction possible, on every thing he may say or do. Nay, they attribute many things to him, the very thought of which never entered his heart, till he found himself accused of them. This line of conduct seems to have been taken from the practice of the Romish priests, who represent those whom they choose to call *heretics*, as guilty of every species of crime imagination can invent: and the Jesuits generally accused their most powerful opponents of *heresy*. The Romish clergy, call their *heretics*, enemies of the Church: these preachers, call those who stand in the way of their own schemes of

“ambition and power, enemies of the work of God, &c. and from an
 “affectation of *charity*, pray for them in a way that only tends to inflame
 “the minds of the people against them, by making them appear more
 “guilty; and to give a greater display of their own goodness, by pre-
 “tending a concern for them, and for the interests of the people. Thus
 “we see, *these* men imitate their great *exemplars* in these kinds of
 “contests, with wonderful exactness. Their language indeed differs,
 “but the governing spirit in both is the same; and in the same circum-
 “stances would produce the same effects! It is natural for the un-
 “suspecting people at first to believe that *none* of the preachers would
 “bring accusations against an individual, (or any number of individuals
 “associated together,) merely for the purpose of ruining his reputation
 “with the Society, that their own schemes may the better succeed: and
 “yet this was undoubtedly the fact in the case before us; and I wish it
 “were the only fact of the kind that might be recorded. It is easy for
 “these men to bear down any individual for a long time, as he has
 “generally no immediate access to the people, to prove his own inno-
 “cence; and they have the pulpit, which they may make use of to keep
 “up an influence against him. In this case innocence is no protection
 “against universal prejudice and reproach; and the best friends to the
 “Connexion, may be sacrificed to the secret machinations of a combi-
 “nation of few preachers. And what is still worse, they have no
 “redress, since the death of Mr. Wesley, but through the medium of
 “their enemies; and every one will easily conjecture how this must
 “terminate. The reader will observe, that I speak only of a few of
 “the preachers, whose conduct is so very reprehensible; yet I cannot
 “help blaming the rest, for continuing these violent men in the Con-
 “nexion, and more especially for continuing them in any office of
 “government in the Societies, as it brings the whole body of the
 “preachers, however innocent, under a suspicion of favouring such
 “unchristian proceedings; which, if not vigorously opposed, must ruin
 “the whole system, and bring religion itself into disgrace. He there-
 “fore acts the part of a true friend to *Methodism*, who resists practices
 “so destructive in their tendency, and who endeavours, by every lawful
 “method in his power, to prevent a repetition of them: who shews in
 “a strong light, that men capable of adopting *such iniquitous means*
 “of carrying their schemes into effect, are not fit to be *Methodist*
 “preachers; and that, it becomes the indispensable duty of the rest, to
 “cut off a hand, a foot, and even to pluck out a right eye, and to cast
 “them away, rather than the whole body should perish—I shall only
 “observe further on this disagreeable subject, that the intelligent
 “reader, who is acquainted with the *internal* affairs of the *Methodists*,
 “will easily recollect instances, wherein the truth of what is here stated
 “has been fully proved, and amply illustrated.”

ARTICLE VI.

MR. WATSON'S REMARKS ON BAND-MEETINGS, NOTICED.

(Being a note on page 25.)



Mr. Watson, in his '*Observations on Southey's Life of Wesley*,' has, with his usual ingenuity and captivating manner of writing, attempted to justify band-meetings, but with what success, the reader must judge. He wishes his readers to believe that the confession practiced at band-meetings, is in fact "*nothing more than a general declaration of the religious experience of the week.*" Much as the writer respects Mr. Watson, and exceedingly admires both the ability and beauty of his writing, he hears and reads him with great suspicion; not that he believes Mr. W. deliberately intends to make mis-statements, to argue inconclusively, or to quote falsely; yet the ardour with which he defends the party to which he is at the time attached, produces such an effect upon his mind as to put him off his guard, as the writer thinks will be shewn in this instance, as well as in one which the writer will give in another note. The writer has only to appeal to the band rule itself, and to the Methodists generally who meet in band, to be borne out in asserting that Mr. Watson's statement is very far from the truth. Undoubtedly, he may know individual instances where the parties are too prudent to make any other use of what they may please to call band-meetings, than the one he names; but the writer certainly believes Mr. Watson is too good a logician to draw a general inference from exceptions. Mr. Watson himself, the writer doubts not, on more mature reflection, will see the error into which he has fallen, and acknowledge that Mr. Wesley himself never pretended that the confessions required at band-meetings, were of any such *general nature* as his definition states. Mr. Wesley's express words are, when describing the nature of band-meetings, "To speak each of us in order, freely and plainly, the true state of our souls, with the faults we have committed in thought, word, or deed, and temptations we have felt since our last meeting." Eleven very close questions are then ordered to be put by the leader of the band, one of which is "Has no sin, inward or outward, dominion over you?" Any of the preceding questions, says Mr. Wesley, may be asked as often as the occasion offers; the four following at *every* meeting:—

- "1. What known sins have you committed, since our last meeting?
- "2. What temptations have you met with? 3. How were you delivered? 4. What have you thought, said, or done, of which you doubt whether it be sin or not?" *

The writer can scarcely suppose Mr. Watson ignorant of this; and so, how could he tell his readers that what takes place at these meetings is "*nothing more than a general declaration of the religious experience of the week*"! How Mr. Watson can answer this, the writer knows not!

* See Band Rules, published by Mr. Wesley, 25th Dec. 1738. Also '*Crowther's Portraiture*,' p. 255.

But if these meetings be really no more than Mr. Watson would have his readers believe, why should he attempt to justify them as being strictly confessional meetings. Was it to meet the objections of those who really know from experience what they are? Although we have the assurance of the learned and judicious Hooker, that "The Church of England hath hitherto considered it the safer way to refer men's hidden crimes unto God and themselves *only*,"† yet Mr. Watson would persuade us the very contrary, by one quotation from the homily on repentance. He has also for the same purpose quoted Bishop Taylor. And what is the doctrine of the homily, when *fairly quoted*, the text and context compared? The homily first gives what it states to be the *true sense*, it then gives another sense in which it is merely capable of being understood, saying it *may* also be taken thus, and then it cites the opinion of Johannes Scotus, and says he did "*well perceive*"; and lastly, it gives the authority of Nectarius and St. Augustine, with unqualified approbation. Now as Mr. Watson has deemed it most expedient to exhibit this sense which the homily simply admits "*may*" be put upon it, as the sense which its authors really intended to give as their own, and is quite silent as to any other meaning they attached to the passage in St. James,* the writer thinks it will not be inexpedient in him to give what the homily calls the *true sense*, his readers will then judge, if they will take the trouble of turning to the '*Book of Homilies*,' p. 266—(the London edition of 1633) whether Mr. Watson gives the right sense of the homily.

* Suppose the writer professed to give Mr. Wesley's sentiments, and Mr. Watson's, on the nature of those extraordinary impressions and agitations which are sometimes known to accompany great concern respecting religious truths, and was to select for that purpose a passage in '*Mr. Wesley's Journals*,' shewing his opinion of such a case as came under his own notice at Islington; and suppose he should make a quotation from some extracts Mr. Watson has published, relative to a revival of religion in Scotland, what would he say? Why, just what the writer says in this case, that it is very unfair to attempt to give an author's opinion from garbled quotations.

Mr. Wesley saw many surprising instances of persons falling down in great distress under his ministry, and occasionally he saw persons affected under circumstances which one would have thought he could not but regard as very suspicious, yet he seems to have considered these as cases exhibiting proof of a supernatural influence: whereas it is remarkable, that when he witnessed a case of this kind, in a person unconnected with his own ministry or Society, he appears to have come to a very different conclusion. The account is published by Mr. Wesley himself, in his third Journal (1739) "Sunday 28, (says he) I went, having been long importuned thereto, about five in the evening, with four or five of my friends, to a friend's house, where was one of those commonly called French prophets. After a time, she came in: she seemed of about four or five and twenty, of an agreeable speech and behaviour. She asked why we came? I said, 'to try the spirits, whether they be of God.' Presently after she leaned back in her chair, and seemed to have strong workings in her breast, with deep sighings intermixed. Her head, and hands, and, by turns, every part of her body seemed also to be in a kind of convulsive motion. This continued about ten minutes, till, at six, she began to speak (though the workings, sighings, and contortions of her body, were so intermixed with her words, that she seldom spoke half a sentence together) with a clear strong voice, 'Father, thy will be done, thy will be done. Thus saith the Lord, if any of you that is a father, his child ask bread, will he give him a stone? If he ask a fish, will he give him a scorpion? By this, judge of what ye shall now hear.' She spoke much, all as in the person of God, and mostly in scripture words, of the fulfilling of the prophecies, the coming of Christ now at hand, and spreading of the gospel over all the earth.

† See '*Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity*,'

"The true meaning of it is, that the faithfull ought to acknowledge their offences, whereby some hatred, rancour, ground, or malice, hauing risen or growne among them one to another, that a brotherly reconciliation may be had, without the which nothing that we doe, can be acceptable unto God, as our Sauour Jesus Christ doeth witnessse himselfe, saying, "When thou offerest thine offering at the Altar, if thou remembrest that thy brother hath ought against thee, leaue there thine offering, and goe and be reconciled, and when thou art reconciled, come and offer thine offering."

"And whereas the aduersaries goe about to wrest this place, for "to maintaine their auricular confession withall, they are greatly "deceiued themselves, and doe shamefully deceiue others: for if this "text ought to bee understood of auricular confession: then the priests "are as much bound to confesse themselves vnto the lay people, as the "lay people are bound to confesse themselves vnto them. And if to "pray, is to absolue: then the laytie by this place hath as great authority to absolue the priests, as the priests haue to absolue the layty. "This did Iohannes Scotus, otherwise called Duns, well perceiue, how "vpon this place, writeth on this manner."

"The understanding of it then, is as in these words: Confesse your "sinnes one to another. A perswasion to humility, whereby he willeth "vs to confesse our selues generally vnto our neighbours, that we are "sinners, according to this saying: 'If we say, we haue no sinne, we "deceiue our selues, and the trueth is not in vs.' What neede wee then "to tell forth our sinnes vnto the eare of the priest, sith that they bee "already taken away? Therefore holy Ambrose in his second sermon "upon the hundred and ninetieth Psalme, doeth say full well, 'Doe "shew thy self vnto the Priest. Who is the true Priest, but he which

"Then she exhorted us not to be in haste in judging her spirit, to be or not to be of "God; but to wait vpon God, and he would teach us, if we conferred not with flesh "and blood. She added, with many enforcements, that we must watch and pray, "and take up our cross and be still before God. Two or three of our company were "much affected, and believ'd she spoke by the spirit of God. But this was in no wise "clear to me. The motion might be either *hysterical* or *artificial*. And the same "words any person of a good understanding, and well versed in the scriptures, might "have spoken."

It is somewhat singular, that Mr. Wesley should never have thought of applying this rule to cases of the same kind which occurred in his own Society. Still it would be very partial and unfair to cite this, as containing Mr. Wesley's sentiments on all cases of this kind; for he certainly attached a degree of importance to similar instances which occurred in his own Society. Mr. Watson has favoured the world with extracts from several works on extraordinary revivals of religion, and in those extracts, we find the following passage. "Physical sympathy in a crowd might sometimes produce bodily convulsions, which had no connexion with any religious feeling." But would it be fair from hence to argue, that Mr. Watson explained away all religious feelings in the same way. This method of quoting, would just be as fair as Mr. Watson's mode of quoting the Homilies. Nevertheless it must be admitted by every candid inquirer into the nature of revival meetings, as they are termed, that tho' persons whose minds have been previously prepared, may receive benefit while attending meetings conducted even in an unscriptural and injudicious manner, so long as the important truths of the gospel are clearly insisted on; yet others there will be, and those often the most vociferous, who merely have their animal feelings excited, while they are almost totally ignorant of the very first principles of Christianity. Where impressions are totally independent of the exercise of the understanding, unconnected with moral perceptions, and unproductive of holy tempers and heavenly dispositions, they ought to be justly suspected, however imposing they may be.

“‘is the priest for euer, after the order of Melchisedech.’ Whereby this
 “holy father doeth vnderstand, that both the priesthood and the law being
 “charged, wee ought to acknowledge none other priest for deliuerances
 “from our sins, but our Sauour Jesus Christ, who being soueraigne
 “Bishop, doeth, with the sacrifice of his body and blood, offered once
 “for euer vpon the altar of the Crosse, most effectually cleanse the
 “spirituall leprosie, and wash away the sinnes of all those that with true
 “confession of the same doe flie vnto him. It is most euident and
 “plaine, that this auricular confession hath not his warrant of God’s
 “word, else it had not beene lawfull for Nectarius Bishop of Constan-
 “tinople, vpon a iust occasion to haue put it downe. For when any
 “thing ordayned of God, is by the lewdnesse of men abused, the abuse
 “ought to haue been taken away, and the thing it selfe suffered to re-
 “maine. Moreover these are S. Augustine’s words, ‘What haue I to
 “doe with men, that they should heare my confession, as though they
 “were able to heale my diseases? A curious sort of men to know
 “another mans life, and slothfully to correct and amend their owne.
 “Why do they seek to heare of me what I am, which will not heare
 “of thee what they are? And how can they tell when they heare by
 “me of my selfe, whether I tell the trueth or not, sith no mortall man
 “knoweth what is in man, but the spirit of man which is in him?’—
 “Augustine would not haue written thus, if auricular confession had
 “beene vsed in his time. Being therefore not led with the conscience
 “theroof, let vs with feare and trembling, and with a true contrite heart,
 “vse that kinde of confession, that God doeth command in his *word*,
 “then doubtlesse, as he is faythfull and righteouse, he will forgine vs our
 “sinnes, and make vs cleane from all wickednesse. I doe not say, but
 “that if any doe finde themselves troubled in conscience, they may re-
 “paire to their learned curate or pastour, or to some other godly learned
 “man, and shew the trouble and doubt of their conscience to them,
 “that they may receiue at their hand the comfortable salue of God’s
 “word: but it is against the true Christian liberty, that any man should
 “bee bound to the numbring of his sins, as it hath beene vsed hereto-
 “fore in the time of blindnesse and ignorance.” *

The writer thinks no one will conclude, after this, that when the whole is seen, this homily, as quoted by Mr. Watson, ought to haue been quoted as favouring the principle of band-meeting. What is that principle? Why, that one individual shall once a week make a special confession to another individual, of his sins and temptations, and go into the detail by shewing how he was delivered from the temptation, if he did not fall into it, and if he did, then he must confess that sin; and in order to secure this, the individual to whom he is to confess, is directed by the very rule of the band, to put these special questions *every* week. Nay the rule goes still further, not only must every individual who meets in band according to the rule, submit to be asked “the most searching questions” respecting the temptations he or she may have had, but they must declare that they desire that the enquirer (called the leader of the band) should “come as close as possible, cut to the quick, and search their heart to the bottom”! If it were possible to go

* See Homily on Repentance.

farther than this, the rule even goes farther: for the individual is not only to declare his desire to be subject to this inquisition, but he is to engage that he desires to be voluntarily communicative, entirely open, so as to speak every thing that is in his heart "without exception, without disguise, and without reserve." Could human ingenuity form any thing more binding, explicit, and circumstantial? And these, we are informed, were only "some of the questions, which may be in effect, proposed to *every one* before he is admitted into band."

Now what says our Homily; does it approve of any individual, either male or female, married or single, passing such an ordeal before a fellow-creature, whether alone, or in the presence of two or three more? It appears not, for it says, (adopting the language of St. Augustine) "What have I to do with men, that they should heare my confession, as though they were able to heale my diseases. A curious sort of men to know another mans life."

But Mr. Watson has an answer at hand, such as it is. "They (band meetings) have been compared to the auricular confession of the Papists, but ignorantly enough, for the confession is in itself essentially different, and it is not made to a minister, but takes place among private Christians."

It is very easy to assert all this, especially if by turning to a good author, (vol. vi. p. 293) it is asserted for us. But how does Mr. Watson prove that a confession made in private to a Catholic priest, and the same confession made to the examiner or leader in a Methodist band, "is in itself *essentially* different." If it be made to the leader alone, it is essentially the same; though it differs in its accidental, and may also in its incidental qualities. In both cases it is a systematic confession of sin, by one human being to another. In one case the confession is made to a layman, in the other to an ecclesiastic: but what essential difference does that make? If one of these individuals was more proper to receive the confession than the other, the writer imagines it to be the ecclesiastic, as being (generally speaking) better qualified to receive the confession, by profession and education, than the other. If we suppose, that in the band-meeting more persons are present, it neither alters the principle, nor mends the practice, any more than a confession to three or four priests would be better than to one; nor would it essentially alter the practice, if the priests made confession in return. But perhaps Mr. Watson will reply, that the principle is recognized by the Church of England, which encourages persons whose consciences are oppressed to make their case known to a Clergyman. But surely there is an essential difference between such occasional and exempt cases, (for which the Church of England has made very prudent provision,) and that of a weekly meeting appointed for the purposes provided for by the rules above quoted. If it be said that the difference consists in this, that the Catholic priest professes to absolve those who make confession to him, and the leader of a Methodist band does not,—the writer answers, that it is the subject of *confession* he is considering, and not that of *absolution*. He contends, that so far as *confession* is concerned, the two meetings are *essentially* the same; although there is the still more objectionable adjunct of *absolution* in the Catholic practice.

It may be remarked, that the Dissenters, as well as Churchmen, agree with the writer in his opinion of band-meetings, and especially in their approximating so nearly to Popish confessions. Messrs. Bogue and Bennet, in their '*History of the Dissenters*,' vol. iii. p. 51, observe "The grand objection which judicious Protestants urge against Popish confession is, not that it is made to a *priest*, but that it is made to a *creature*. When therefore Mr. Wesley makes it a principal rule in these bands, to 'tell every fault which they have committed in thought, word, or deed, and every temptation with which they have met;' who can wonder if impartial persons should be shocked at the idea of setting up our fellow-creatures on the throne of the heart-searching Deity, and most vehemently suspect the sincerity of those who would pretend to tell all their wrong thoughts and feelings to any mortal, much less to a company? As to the *morality*, not to say the *spirituality* of this practice, it is liable to all the objections to Popish confession, that it tends to revive ideas which should be consigned to oblivion, and imparting to others ideas of which it is their happiness to remain ignorant. So far, indeed, is the Methodist confession from being less objectionable than the Papistical, that if one must be adopted, we should not hesitate to prefer that which is made to a single experienced person in private, to that which is made to a whole band."

The writer is perfectly aware, that the meetings termed band-meetings are now somewhat differently conducted to what they were in the early days of Methodism; but even now, they seem subject to very weighty objections, as has been already intimated in that part of the letter on which this is a note, (see p. 25.) If it be objected that the writer has referred to one instance only, where the practice he argues against has produced bad effects, and that he has not stated what they were, he replies, that if he is called on he can give the detail, and give a sufficient number of other cases to justify him in what he has said.

ARTICLE VII.

MR. WESLEY'S SERMON ON THE VINEYARD CONSIDERED,

In answer to Mr. Watson's Remarks upon it, in reply to Robert Southey, Esq.

(Being a note on page 28 of this Letter.)



If Mr. Watson's manner of quoting from the Homilies has been shewn to be very extraordinary, and exhibits too much appearance of special pleading, the reader will be much more surprised to learn how he has handled this subject.

No doubt, feeling the force of this powerful passage, which Mr. Wesley's singular candour and fearless regard to truth induced him to leave to his followers, Mr. Watson dexterously attempts to ward off the whole, by endeavouring to shew that Mr. Wesley, so far from making any admissions as to the inefficiency of Methodist ordinances, was all the while speaking of the Church of England, not of Methodism!!!

When the writer first read Mr. Watson's '*Observations*,' he was not a little surprised to find the following passage:—

"But the dishonesty of our author (Mr. Southey) must here be exposed. Mr. Southey dexterously slipped out a sentence between two parts of the quotation. Mr. Wesley, after asking 'might I not have expected a general increase of faith and love of righteousness, &c.' adds—was it not reasonable to expect that these fruits would have overspread his whole *Church*?' This is left out. Now the term *Church* he never applied to his Societies, but to the Church of England, and here he clearly means by it, all throughout the land who profess to be of her communion."

The writer felt very unwilling to believe, that Mr. Southey could be guilty of "dishonesty" even in the sense Mr. Watson intended; and was equally unwilling to believe, Mr. Watson would bring such a charge against a gentleman of Mr. Southey's very high moral and literary character, unless he had positive proof of his guilt. The writer saw that the fact of giving a quotation of two sentences and leaving out a middle one, might be very innocently and properly done, where its being retained was not necessary to the sense, and would save trouble, &c. in the quotation. To solve his doubts, therefore, the writer turned to Mr. Wesley's works, and found the quotation taken from the *Sermon on the Vineyard*, (vol. x. p. 358) from *Isaiah* v. 4. "What could I have done more to my vineyard than I have done in it. Wherefore when I looked that it should bring forth grapes, brought it forth wild grapes!"

The reader will bear in mind that the question at issue is, whether Mr. Wesley brought what he terms "this tender expostulation" against the Methodist Connexion, or the Church of England? This, the writer thinks, will soon be decided. Mr. Wesley was generally very methodical and logical in his statements, defining his terms, and using

them in one fixed determinate sense. This he has certainly done here. He commences thus—"The vineyard of the Lord"—"Taking the word "in its widest sense, may include the whole world; but in a narrow "sense, the Christian world; in a still narrower sense, the reformed "part of the Christian Church. In the narrowest of all, one may by that "phrase "The vineyard of the Lord" mean, that body of people commonly called *Methodists*. In this sense I understand it now, meaning "thereby that Society *only*, which began at Oxford in 1729, and remains "united at this day. Understanding the word in this sense, I repeat "the question which God proposes to the Prophet—"What could I have "done for my vineyard, &c."

"I. With regard to doctrine.

"II. _____ scriptural helps,

"III. _____ discipline; and

"IV. _____ outward protection."

Mr. Wesley then goes on to speak of the peculiar as well as general doctrines and discipline of the Methodists. In fact, the whole sermon is to shew the peculiar privileges enjoyed by the Methodist Connexion, and the little comparative good which it had derived from them; but not one word respecting the doctrines or discipline of the Church of England.

Some time ago, the writer called on a very intelligent pious friend, (who is a member of the Methodist Society, and a friend of Mr. Watson's) and shewed him Mr. Watson's remarks, and Mr. Wesley's sermon. They sat down and read the sermon carefully over, and were really at a loss to account for Mr. Watson's extraordinary line of defence. They both knew Mr. Watson, and respected his character and talents, and therefore felt unwilling to come to any severe conclusion against him, contenting themselves with supposing that he had been incautious enough to reply, without giving himself the trouble to turn to the sermon! Still they could not but regard it, if so, as an instance of very culpable negligence; but more especially as he had (and the writer was sorry to notice this and other instances of very uncourteous behaviour toward Mr. Southey in Mr. Watson's '*Observations*') charged him with "dishonesty."

Mr. Wesley appears to have considered the Methodist Connexion as a vineyard, on which peculiar labour had been bestowed; but that the fruit it had produced was not such as might have been reasonably expected. Or to speak without a figure, that the system of doctrine, discipline, &c. peculiar to the Connexion, might have been much more efficient; and that had the Societies improved their privileges as they ought to have done, they would have effected infinitely more good in the country: here he expostulates with them. Just following the long quotation (see p. 28 of this letter) given from the sermon, and to which this is a note, Mr. Watson says—"But of whom is this affirmed? Mr. Southey "says of the great body of Mr. Wesley's followers"—and yet under his "eye, in the same paragraph, these censures are restricted to the rich; to "persons 'increased in goods,' and consequently were not spoken of "the body, who, as Mr. Southey knows, were sufficiently poor. But then, "perhaps, these few rich persons were Mr. Wesley's "followers"? Mr. "Southey cannot even thus be exculpated, for almost in the same breath "Mr. Wesley declares that they despise communion with the Society."

To which the writer replies, 1. that Mr. Southey seems to him quite correct in supposing Mr. Wesley spoke of the great body of his "followers." In other words, to the Methodists at large, and also of such as were in constant attendance at the Methodist chapels; but chiefly the former, because he expressly says so: "meaning thereby" (says he) "that Society *only* which began at Oxford in 1729, and remains united to this day." * 2. Mr. Watson has no proof that what is said respecting the rich, was under Mr. Southey's eye "in the same paragraph." It is under the writer's eye in the *next* paragraph, and he has before him the 10th vol. of '*Mr. Wesley's Works*,' printed at the Conference press, the very work Mr. Southey refers to. If Mr. Watson thought proper to be so very minute, in order to correct Mr. Southey, it was worth his while to be correct himself. 3. But what has the writer before his eye? Certainly nothing that restricts the meaning of the three foregoing paragraphs to the rich; the very contrary. Mr. Wesley begins his new paragraph (the fourth) with a separate exhortation to the rich.— 4. But Mr. Southey must be found wrong, and it is to be in this, that he imagines these to be members; whereas Mr. Wesley, we are informed, says they were rich, and as Mr. Southey knows the body were sufficiently poor, he cannot be speaking of the body. How is Mr. Southey to know all this? Is it because Mr. Wesley says (vol. xv. 333) "For the Methodists in every place grow diligent and frugal, consequently they increase in goods. Hence they proportionably increase in pride, in anger, in the desire of the flesh, the desire of the eye, and the pride of life. So, although the form of religion remains, the spirit is swiftly vanishing away. What way then (I ask again) can we take, that our money may not sink us to the nethermost hell? If those who gain all they can, and save all they can, will likewise give all they can, then the more they will grow in grace, and the more treasure they will lay up in heaven."

But Mr. Watson would fain persuade his readers that he has again detected Mr. Southey quoting dishonestly, and refers to the following passage—"Mr. Fletcher, he (Mr. Southey) observes, confirms this unfavourable representation, and indicates one of its causes." Mr. Watson says, "Mr. Fletcher does not refer at all to the members of the Methodist Societies, and the followers of Mr. Wesley. On the contrary, he is speaking of those who adopted the Antinomian creed, the virulent opposers of Mr. Wesley and his "followers"; and he points out the practical evils of the Antinomian heresy, an error which never infected the Methodist Societies."

Now let the reader judge. The passage occurs in '*Mr. Fletcher's Works*,' vol. ii. p. 241.

"These reflections made me not only suspend my judgment concerning Mr. Wesley's propositions, but consider what we may candidly suppose was his design in writing them for, and recommending them to, the preachers in connexion with him. And I could not help seeing, that it was only to guard them and their hearers against Antinomian principles and practices, *which spread like wild-fire in some of his Societies*; where persons who spoke in the most

* See '*Wesley's Works*,' vol. x. p. 348.

"glorious manner of Christ, and their interest in his complete salvation, "have been found living in the greatest immoralities, or indulging the "most unchristian tempers. Nor need I go far for a proof of this sad "assertion. *In one of his Societies not many miles from my parish.*" Mr. Fletcher then records a lamentable instance of the person he names falling into sin.

Now where, then, does Mr. Fletcher go? Why, if you believe Mr. Southey, he finds his example in some of Mr. Wesley's Societies, "where," he says, "these principles and practices had spread like wild- "fire." If you believe Mr. Watson, Mr. Fletcher did not refer to any of Mr. Wesley's "followers" or Societies. Happily we have Mr. Fletcher's own words at hand, which are "In one of his (Mr. Wesley's) "Societies not far from my parish." After enumerating almost as many evils as Mr. Wesley named in the quotation given from his Sermon on the Vineyard, Mr. Fletcher says (personating Mr. Wesley) "How few of our Societies are there where this, or some other evil "has not broken out;" and he particularly names "Selfish views, "sinister designs, inveterate prejudice, pitiful bigotry, party spirit, "self-sufficiency, contempt of others, envy, jealousy, making men of- "fenders for a word, putting the worst construction upon each other's "actions, false accusations, backbiting, malice, revenge, persecution. "The consequences (says Mr. Fletcher) of this high and yet lifeless "profession, are as evident as they are deplorable." (p. 244.)

The writer is really at a loss to conceive how Mr. Watson could give such a representation of this subject as he has done: and yet could say of Mr. Southey, "But the dishonesty of our author must here be "exposed."

ARTICLE VIII.

MR. WEST'S CONDUCT RELATIVE TO THE OSBORNE-STREET
CHAPEL, HULL.

Neither Mr. West nor the other Irish preachers could have done the cause of Church Methodism much injury, had the friends of the Connexion acted a consistent and uniform part." The reader may see, by turning to page 33, how true this is as it relates to Mr. M'Conkey, and it is equally true as it respects Mr. West, and two ladies in this neighbourhood, to whom the writer had the misfortune to introduce him. As these ladies were, no doubt, conscious that their strange proceedings would soon become matter of conversation, they endeavoured to bespeak the suffrages of their acquaintance, by making their own statement, and as that statement is very far from the truth, it may not be unnecessary to give a brief but true and correct relation of the affair. The writer considers himself the more especially called on to do so, as they have given a turn to one transaction in which he was particularly engaged, very far from the truth.

It should be kept in mind, that these ladies (two sisters) were amongst the first to take a very decided and zealous part in the promotion of Church Methodism, and continually exhorted the writer and his friends to stand fast against the wiles and artifices of the Methodist preachers generally, and of Mr. Galland, and a relation of theirs, in particular. When Mr. Atkinson and the writer went to the Dublin Conference, and proved firm against an attempt to bind the Societies here to the *peculiarities* of Methodism, these ladies were loud in their praise for having stood fast, and said they had acted a noble part, in being firm under such trying circumstances. When Mr. M'Afee and Mr. M'Conkey complained to them that the trustees were not acting properly toward them, these ladies took up arms for them, especially for Mr. M'Afee; but on hearing both sides, and becoming a little cool, they contended the trustees had acted rightly, and were so incensed against these preachers, that nothing would satisfy them but their being instantly removed to Liverpool, and some one being sent with them to see them safely on board for Ireland. When Mr. West came over, they were full of exhortations, especially to the writer, to "stand fast," and take care that he did not deceive the trustees, nor acquire any property in the chapels. But very soon they became so pleased with him, that nothing would satisfy them but the trustees placing him at the head of Church Methodism, like another Mr. Wesley; and the writer believes, had it not been for them, he never would have been emboldened to take the steps he did, relative to the chapel in Hull. It appears that these ladies, in their zeal to support Mr. West, actually procured him, at their own risk, £300. with which to secure the Hull chapel; such at least was his own account of it, and so far as very strong circumstantial evidence goes, seems to have been the truth. Whether they

intended that he should buy the chapels for the trustees, or for himself, is yet a mystery; though some suppose, that out of anxiety to see him provided for, they were privy to the means he used to get the chapel into his own hands: in confirmation of which, the writer will notice one circumstance before he closes this article, which shews how strongly they felt on the subject.

The method Mr. West used to secure the Hull chapel, the writer will briefly notice, as it is uncertain whether the letter referred to at page 35, (containing a full account) and also a letter addressed to one of the ladies in question, may ever be published. The writer was directed by the acting trustees of the Beverley chapel to purchase the Osborne-street chapel, provided several respectable trustees could be found, some of whom would take an interest in the prosperity of Church Methodism in Hull. He accordingly called on three highly respectable gentlemen, with whom he had had some previous conversation on the general question, viz. Mr. W. H. Dikes, Mr. J. N. Crosse, and Mr. Edward Spence, who, with Mr. Newbald, Mr. Buckton, and several others, agreed to become trustees. Mr. W. H. Dikes, Mr. Spence, and the writer called on Mr. Tinkler, to purchase the chapel of him. While they were in conversation with him, a messenger from Mr. Dryden's office informed Mr. Tinkler that Mr. West, from Beverley, wanted him. This surprised them not a little. They stepped out to speak with a friend for a short time, and on their return, finding Mr. Tinkler remained at Mr. Dryden's office, Mr. W. H. Dikes and the writer proceeded to Mr. Dryden's, when, to their astonishment, they found Mr. West had purchased the chapel for one thousand guineas, and had actually deposited £300., which they saw laid on the desk, and had got the chapel conveyed to himself! On the writer's enquiring of Mr. West, whether the Beverley trustees were aware of his coming over to Hull, he said, no; but he was afraid lest Mr. Smelt, Mr. Bell Robinson, and Mr. McConkey should procure it for the Irish Connexion, and therefore, as Providence had put £300. in his power, he had come over privately to secure it, lest it should be bought from the Church Methodists, as he was afraid the writer might hesitate to secure it, and suffer it to fall into the hands of the Irish. He repeatedly and emphatically assured them that all was right. This they thought very strange; and as they heard the name of one of the ladies in question mentioned, and had reason from circumstances to apprehend that he had prevailed with them to advance him the £300., it was thought advisable to lose no time in informing those ladies what had occurred, that if he had deceived them, as well as the trustees, they might adopt immediate measures for their own security. To the writer's surprise, however, they both denied having any thing to do with it, which as they repeated several times, he ceased to offer any further observations on the subject. Mr. West, however, next morning came in great haste to seek for the writer, in order to renew his protestations that all was right, that he had purchased the chapel for the trustees, and complained of the writer's having made any communication to these ladies, who, he observed, had in consequence "*got no sleep all night!*" and afterwards he reproached the writer for having gone to the ladies, of whom he (Mr. West) said he had received the money.

The circumstance to which the writer has alluded, as affording proof how much those ladies felt determined to promote Mr. West's interest, is this—one day as they and the writer were talking over the affairs of Church Methodism, they passed the most extravagant eulogium on Mr. West, and proposed that he should take the government of Church Methodism into his own hands, and this they did in a manner and with an earnestness which could not be misunderstood. As they were very urgent in pressing this, as well as that he should have the Hull chapel secured to him, the writer was morally certain that if he refused to come into the measure, their friendly intercourse, which had been of near sixteen years' standing, would be at an end. They probably calculated that, as he was under great obligations to them, he would not have courage to refuse their request, as far as he was concerned, but in this they were mistaken. The writer confesses it was painful to oppose those from whom he had received so many favours, and from whom he was under considerable expectations; but he was enabled to prefer duty to interest. The principal objection was this—Both the sisters had from time to time, without the least solicitation on the writer's part, pressed him to receive various sums of money of them, for which he gave them promissory notes on demand; in the interim they appointed him a joint executor for one of the sisters, and the other assured him, on his receiving one of the last sums of money she brought him, that he need not hesitate to receive it, as her sister would alter her will, and he should only have the interest of it to pay during the life of the survivor, and then there would be an end of it. These sums he had regarded from that time (as three of his friends know) as his own, and therefore when he was called on to comply with the wishes of those ladies, so far as his own concurrence would go, he felt persuaded that he must either oblige them, or suffer for it; however he instantly made up his mind to pursue a straight forward path, and leave the consequence. He told them that he could not come into any such arrangement himself, and reminded them that the Church Methodists had separated from the Conference Connexion partly on account of the arbitrary form of its government, whereas this would be placing the power in the hands of one man, and a stranger too, who had come over uninvited, and had not yet met the charges to be preferred against him at the Irish Conference. The writer urged that the trustees had already published the form of a constitution, (and one of which these ladies themselves had professed to approve,) by which the power was to be placed in the hands of the travelling preachers on the one part, and representatives from the Societies on the other; and that they stood pledged to the public that this should be the form of constitution they would adopt—that it would be acting a strange part to falsify all their promises, and adopt a totally different constitution—and that therefore, though he was but an individual, assuming no superiority over the other trustees, he could not, and was sorry for it, take any part in such an arrangement. The ladies were evidently disappointed, and one of them shewed strong marks of her displeasure, so much so as to call on her the observations of her sister.

What the writer had apprehended was soon realized, for in a few weeks the ladies ordered the money to be paid in which they had lent the writer, which indeed one of them had given him, as already stated.

On the writer's informing one of them that her sister had given him the money, she professed (and perhaps sincerely) to be quite surprised, and said she would speak to her sister. Accordingly, the same day, they both called on him, and on his repeating to the lady who had given him the money what he had said to her sister, she seemed exceedingly confused, and said—"there must have been some mistake in it, that all the money the writer had of theirs was not hers to give." He said, "you must know, Mrs. ———, that you thrust the last sum of money I received of you, or the last but one, into my hands, and said what I have told your sister." She again said, "there must have been some mistake." He said "there could be no mistake, it was a matter of too much interest to me to be mistaken about in the way you suppose, and that were I in dying circumstances, I should not scruple to declare the same." She replied, "I do not think you would say what you do if you did not believe it." The writer understands that afterwards she said positively to some of her friends, that she did not give him the money. However, had the sum of money been ten times as large as it was, the writer hopes it would not have induced him to act differently from what he did. How these ladies can reconcile it to their consciences to act as they have done towards the writer, who never intentionally did any thing to offend them, nor acted in this business otherwise than agreeably to the very principles which they themselves recognized and approved, he knows not. He cannot but think, that on a nearer approach to another world, this injustice will be found a subject of bitter repentance to them.

The morning after the writer had the conversation with these ladies, respecting Mr. West's proceedings in purchasing the Hull chapel, Mr. West called on him, and renewed his assurance that all was correct respecting the Hull chapel, which he had purchased privately lest Mr. Smelt, Mr. Bell Robinson, and Mr. M'Conkey should have bought it for the Irish Methodists; and that he intended it to be settled on the same trust as the Beverley chapel: and he requested a trustee meeting might be called the following evening. Accordingly the trustees met, when he renewed his assertions, and agreed to give the chapel up to them. The meeting requested he would ascertain whether the parties of whom he had procured the money were willing to let it remain awhile on interest. He promised to do so, and at the next meeting he brought a paper purporting to be from them, offering to let £200. remain, and that £100. should be paid on the trustees taking possession. This the trustees agreed to, and sent the parties, by Mr. West, a counter undertaking. Things being thus settled, and having no reason to doubt but that Mr. West would be compelled by the parties to fulfil his agreement, Mr. W. H. Dikes and the writer proceeded to solicit subscriptions in Hull (in which they were very successful) for the liquidation of the chapel debt. In the mean time Mr. West was very anxious that the chapel should be cleaned, painted, &c. in order that as soon as possible he might preach the opening sermon. They consented, and Mr. W. H. Dikes, Mr. West, and the writer gave orders accordingly to several persons to repair, clean and paint the chapel. At the opening of the chapel most of the trustees attended to make the collection, which was placed in the hands of Mr. Newbald; and Mr. W.

H. Dikes informed Mr. West that the trustees would meet on the following day (Monday) at four o'clock. They met at the time appointed, but Mr. West never made his appearance. After sending to several places in search of him, the trustees requested that Mr. W. H. Dikes and the writer would speak to him in the vestry after the evening preaching. Accordingly they and Messrs. Crozer & Graham met Mr. West in the vestry, when they expressed their surprise that he had not attended the trustee meeting. He said he did not know where it was to be held. Mr. W. H. Dikes replied, that he believed he named the school-room in High-street (Mr. Newbald's) as the place, and four o'clock as the time; but at any rate he might have made enquiry. Mr. West said he had enquired of Mr. Baker, one of Mr. Robinson's young men. Mr. W. H. Dikes and the writer replied, that they had just come from Mr. Baker, who said Mr. West made no enquiry respecting the meeting whatever. He had once that day asked if he (Mr. Baker) knew where Mr. Robinson was, and he replied he believed at Mr. King's; and that Mr. West made no further enquiry. The trustees then observed, that they were prepared to pay the money agreed upon for the transfer. On that, Mr. West produced a long paper containing a number of conditions, such as that he should have a right to claim the pulpit for life, have a regular salary allowed out of the chapel, &c. &c. and moreover be paid £350. instead of £300. before he could make the transfer. Mr. W. H. Dikes said it was agreed upon by the parties who had advanced the £300. on the one hand, (that is, according to Mr. West's account,) and by the trustees on the other, that so soon as the trustees paid £100., Mr. West should transfer his interest in the chapel; that he had £100. with him ready to be produced, and that therefore he could not understand why Mr. West should hesitate. He said Mr. West had stated that the reason why he came over from Beverley in such haste, was to secure the chapel for the Church Methodists of Beverley and Hull, lest the Irish Methodists should get it, and now there was ever so much hesitation as to giving it up. Mr. West replied, that he thought the Church Methodists ought to consider themselves much indebted to him for having procured the chapel, as it was clear they were not prepared to pay the deposit, which Mr. Tinkler had assured him was to have been paid by *one o'clock* on the day on which he purchased it. This the writer and Mr. W. H. Dikes flatly denied, and told him Mr. Tinkler had only limited them to one o'clock as to *closing the bargain*; but had offered them several weeks to pay the £300. in. He said he had Mr. Tinkler's hand-writing for it; but when challenged to produce it, he refused, and pretended to read from a paper he held in his hand, but would not shew it,—but even his own reading only proved that the limit was respecting *the completion of the purchase, not the payment of the money*. The trustees reproached him for refusing to transfer the chapel according to the agreement; to which he only replied, that he must have £350. paid down, or he could not part with the chapel—and that for his own part, he thought he should go to *his Societies in America*, referring to a Society at St. John's, and one at Quebec. At the latter place he had succeeded in enlarging or building a chapel, and contrived to get the deed so drawn as to make the chapel his own property, and brought the deed with him to England. The meeting then

broke up, and Mr. West never spoke to the Hull trustees from that day to this. Soon after, the workmen who had been employed, as before stated, for repairing the chapel, &c. applied to Mr. W. H. Dikes for the payment of their accounts, the particulars of which the reader may see in the next article, which contains it, with Mr. W. H. Dikes' and Mr. Smelt's correspondence on the subject.

The reader will at once see that the demand of £350. instead of £300., and indeed instead of £100. in the first instance, with all the other provisions, (to which Mr. West knew the trustees could not, according to their published constitution comply,) was in effect refusing to give the chapel up; and his subsequent conduct shewed what his secret intention was from the beginning. The Primitive Wesleyan Methodists of Ireland, in whose Connexion Mr. West had been a very zealous preacher, threatened to bring several charges against him at their then ensuing Conference; and Mr. W. seems to have been most anxious to make his peace with them, by betraying the cause of Church Methodism into their hands, and as he failed in this, the only offering he had to present was the Osborne-street chapel, which he accordingly disposed of to some of the friends of the Irish Connexion here—report says, to Mr. Bell Robinson (who offered the thousand guineas for the chapel, as noticed at p. 35) and to Mr. Smelt. If they be the owners of the chapel, it will to some excite as much surprise that they should have preaching in it in canonical hours, (viz. at half-past ten in the morning, and two or half-past two in the afternoon, as well as in the evening at six,) as that Mr. Ford and Mr. McConkey have offered their services to the *Dissenting Conference Connexion*. It is understood that the President, Mr. Watson, has given them no encouragement to apply for admission into the English Conference, but refers them to the Methodists of their own country!!!

The correspondence between Mr. W. H. Dikes and Mr. Smelt will shew the reader, that though the workmen who repaired and painted the chapel, &c. had a *legal* claim on the writer and Mr. W. H. Dikes, yet *equitably* considered, the present owners of the chapel are bound to pay, as Mr. W. H. Dikes has very clearly and ably shewn; and to which Mr. Smelt has been able to return no satisfactory reply, but, as is frequently the case with those who are conscious of the badness of their cause, has grown very angry, not to say abusive. Mr. W. H. Dikes' very kind and christian reply, does infinite credit to his heart as well as to his head. Since then, the principal subscribers to the Hull chapel have been consulted; they regard the present owners of the chapel equitably liable, and bound in honour and justice to pay; but, as they refuse, and the workmen might be inconvenienced for want of their money, they have thought it better for Mr. W. H. Dikes to pay the accounts.

Soon after Mr. West had sold the chapel to the friends of the Irish Methodists, he went to the Dublin Conference. It appears that the party in Cork who had intended to impeach him at the Conference, declined appearing, and therefore he was only arraigned for his conduct while in America. The result was, that the Conference refused to receive him as a travelling preacher at present. He then returned to Beverley, in company with Mr. McConkey and Mr. Ford, and obtained

their assistance in endeavouring to get possession of Mr. Hillaby's house and refused to quit until they were threatened with legal proceedings. Mr. West had, previously to his going to the Dublin Conference, amused the trustees with various offers for the purchase of the Beverley chapel; but they growing weary with his vacillation, and disgusted with other parts of his conduct, gave him notice to meet certain charges they had to prefer against him, and desired him to name the person on his part before whom he wished the matter to be brought; this, however, he refused, and as soon as possible left the town for Dublin. It was supposed by some, that the trustees did not give him an opportunity of meeting the charges they wished to prefer against him, but that is very erroneous. It is true that, not supposing he would leave the town for the Conference so soon as he did, they did not send him the letter so early as otherwise they would have done; but he had an interview with Mr. Atkinson in Beverley, after they sent him the letter, but positively refused, to meet the charges they had to prefer against him,—*not on the ground of want of opportunity at all*,—but because he said he would not be accountable for his conduct to any one: though on his first coming to Beverley, he had entered into the following agreement:—

* “ We agree that until a Conference be formed, if any disagreement should arise “between us and our preachers, (himself, *i. e.* Mr. West, or any of them) we will “refer such difference to the decision of a committee of equal number, to be chosen “equally by the parties, which committee shall have power to call in an umpire if “necessary.”

MARK ROBINSON
ANTHONY ATKINSON
JOHN SHEPHERD

WILLIAM CROSSKILL
WILLIAM HEWSON
W. G. STATHER

HENRY CALDER.
—————
G. M. WEST.

On Mr. West's return from the Irish Conference, he no doubt hoped to intimidate the trustees, by seizing on possession of the preacher's house; but in this he soon found his mistake. Mr. M'Conkey and Mr. Ford seems to have indulged the same hope.—When all three had entered Mr. Hillaby's, early in the morning, two of them left Mr. M'Conkey, who refused to quit the house. Mr. Hillaby, however, locked him up, and Mr. Smelt's maid-servant brought him provisions, but of course could not have access to him. When these preachers saw that the trustees were not to be intimidated, they gave up their contest, and Mr. West left the town; and the trustees have heard no more from him since.

ARTICLE IX.

THE TRUSTEES' NOTICE TO MR. WEST.

The reader will see, by referring to the last article, that Mr. West entered into an agreement with the trustees on his first coming to Beverley, that if any difference should arise between himself and them, it should be referred to disinterested persons. Mr. West's conduct having become very obnoxious to the trustees, they sent him the following letter on the 1st of June; and on the 8th they passed the resolutions as given below.

"Beverley, 1st June, 1826.

"Sir,—In order to prevent any misunderstanding in future, we beg
 "to inform you that it is not our wish that you should return after your
 "proposed journey to Ireland, to be our preacher, as we are not satis-
 "fied with your proceedings in several particulars, and therefore wish
 "to give you sufficient notice of our intention. If you desire it, we
 "will at any time meet you before a committee mutually chosen, accord-
 "ing to the agreement we entered into with you, when you first came
 "to Beverley.

We are, Sir, yours, &c.

THOMAS BRIGHAM
 MARK ROBINSON
 W. G. STATHER

ANTHONY ATKINSON
 JOHN SHEPHERD
 HENRY CALDER."

To Mr. G. M. West, Beverley.

"At a meeting of trustees of the Church Methodist Chapel, Beverley, (convened by regular notice) held on Thursday afternoon, 8th June, 1826, present S. Hillaby, A. Atkinson, W. Hewson, J. Shepherd, M. Robinson, W. G. Stather, T. Brigham, H. Calder.

"Resolved 1.—That Mr. G. M. West, their late preacher, having agreed with them that should any difference arise between him and them, such difference should be referred to an impartial committee, mutually and equally chosen: and that, as a difference has arisen, and Mr. West has been served with regular notice to name such person or persons as he wished to sit on such committee; but whereas he has positively refused to submit the investigation of his conduct to such committee, or to any person or persons whatsoever, this meeting is unanimously of opinion, that it is their duty to serve Mr. West with a regular legal notice that they shall provide for him no longer; as well as a notice to Mr. Hillaby, with whom they have boarded him, that they will not be accountable for any thing which he may hereafter provide for Mr. West. 2. That Mr. West be paid his salary from the time of his coming to Beverley to the present time, at the same rate per annum of Mr. McConkey's allowance. 3. That H. J. Shepherd, Esq. be applied to, for the purpose of preparing the notices. 4. That Mr. Atkinson and Mr. Robinson be requested to call on Mr. Shepherd this afternoon, on this business."

These resolutions were signed by all the trustees present, one only being absent.

ARTICLE X.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN MR. W. H. DIKES AND MR. SMELT,
*Respecting the payment of certain workmen, on account of what has now become
 the Primitive Wesleyan Methodist Chapel, Osborne-street, Hull.**

—♦♦♦♦—
 (COPY.)

TO MR. ROBERT SMELT, BEVERLEY.

"Sir,—Having been informed that you are one of those who are in possession of the chapel in Osborne-street, in this town, I take the liberty of addressing you, as a person of candour and consideration, on the subject of the repairs and cleaning of the chapel, which were done immediately before you came into possession of it.

"The circumstances under which these repairs were done, may not be unknown to you; but having been a witness of the whole transaction connected therewith, I may perhaps be allowed to take a short survey of them, before I proceed to press the claim which I have to urge upon you. And as, in the course of my letter, I may have to allude to the two distinct parties which take the name of Church Methodists, I shall, for the sake of perspicuity, denominate them respectively the Church Methodists and the Irish Methodists. I need not inform you of the circumstances under which Mr. West was engaged by the former body, as one of their preachers; it is notorious that he was so engaged; and officiated under their direction. He and the body with which he was connected, finding it necessary for the employment of two preachers, that they should have a chapel at Hull, naturally fixed on that in Osborne-street, which was at that time unoccupied. After much consideration and consultation with Mr. West and others, it was determined that Mr. Mark Robinson should be deputed to purchase it of Mr. Tinkler, the owner, who had already made an offer of the chapel to him. Mr. Robinson, on coming to Hull for that purpose, called on Mr. Edward Spence and myself as friends, requesting us to accompany him to Mr. Tinkler's, which we accordingly did; and were informed by Mr. T. that other parties had also applied to him for the chapel, but that having made an offer of it to Mr. Robinson, he would allow him till one o'clock, and if he did not by that time accede to his terms, he should consider himself at liberty. After a little consultation we returned to Mr. Tinkler's, and were endeavouring to induce him to abate somewhat of his demand, when a message arrived from Mr. Dryden, the attorney, that Mr. Tinkler was immediately wanted at his office.—

* Before Mr. West opened the Chapel, he was anxious that the words "CHURCH METHODIST CHAPEL" should be put in front of the building, in large letters, which was accordingly done; but now that the Chapel is opened in canonical hours, and the preachers have offered their services to the *Dissenting* Methodist Conference, it is to be hoped the owners of the Chapel will take the letters down, as well as order the practice of making collections for "Church Methodist Missions" to be discontinued, since in fact there are none.!!!

Mr. T. left us to obey the summons, and not returning, we sent for him, when he informed the messenger that Mr. West was there, and that they had concluded the bargain. Not knowing how to understand this information, we proceeded to Mr. Dryden's, and found that Mr. West had indeed made the purchase, and paid down the sum required as a deposit; and when questioned as to the cause of his acting in this strange manner, when he knew that Mr. Robinson had been deputed to effect the purchase, he replied, that knowing that the Irish Methodists were endeavouring to obtain the chapel, and had got an offer of it after one o'clock, he was fearful that Mr. Robinson might not be sufficiently early in his application, and that so it might fall into their hands, and that he had therefore borrowed the money, and completed the purchase; but he assured Mr. Robinson that he need be under no apprehension, for *all was right*. Having no reason to doubt his word, we concluded that though his conduct was certainly very strange, yet that there was nothing grossly incorrect in it."

"It being very desirable that the chapel should be opened as soon as possible, Mr. Robinson got me to accompany him and Mr. West to various work people, to whom we gave orders respecting the repairing and cleaning the chapel, which orders were accordingly executed.

"Respecting the subsequent conduct of Mr. West, I make no remark; you know more of it than I do, having only heresay testimony respecting it. All that I have to do with, is the result of that conduct, namely, that the chapel, instead of being placed at the disposal of those for whom he professed to have purchased it, was transferred to the Irish Methodists. These are all undeniable facts, and on these facts it is that I would urge upon you the claim which is the object of my troubling you with this letter, namely, that those who are in possession of the chapel are bound, by every tie of honesty, justice, and honour, to pay the expenses which were incurred in repairing and cleaning it. There are only three parties against whom, either in law or equity, any claim can lie—the Church Methodists, Mr. West, and the Irish Methodists.—With regard to the former, though legally they are unquestionably compellable to pay, yet they cannot by any principle of honour or Christianity be bound to pay for that from which they have not derived the smallest advantage, and into which they were ignorantly led by false pretences. Neither should Mr. West be charged with these repairs, for having transferred his interest in the chapel, he derives no benefit from them. But the case is very different as it regards the third party; to them the chapel has been turned over by Mr. West, not with any advantage to himself, but they have merely (to use a vulgar mode of expression) *stepped into his shoes*; and therefore, by every principle of justice and equity, have made themselves liable to whatever, as possessor of that chapel, he was liable. Besides, they are enjoying the whole of the benefit of those improvements and alterations which were made, and which, had they not been previously done by other parties, they themselves must have done at their own expense. Why then now object to pay those charges which they must have incurred, had not other parties unwittingly incurred them for them? Why, I say, except that they think that the law will enable them to do what equity and justice would condemn? I would just ask, if you, as an

individual, were about to occupy a house, and some other person, under a mistaken idea that the house was let to him, were to proceed, before he discovered his error, to clean it and do such other necessary repairs as you yourself must have done when you obtained possession of it, would you not consider that though the law would not compel you to repay him the expenses incurred, yet that you were acting a very dishonourable part were you not to remunerate him? And I think that the enjoyment of these comforts would be by no means enhanced in an honourable mind, by the consideration that they had been procured at the charge of another. And, I ask, why should a body feel and act differently from an individual? I can see no reason but that each member of that body, considering himself sheltered by numbers, fancies that the obloquy attached to a dishonourable act does not rest upon himself, and thus a person will do, in a corporate capacity, what he would scorn to do as an individual. This is the way of the world, but will persons bearing the names of Methodists, and professing to be guided by the purer principles of the Gospel, will they thus let their conduct belie their profession? and will you, Sir, as one of that body, thus sully a character which, as far as I have heard, is otherwise free from stain?

"But, I have been informed, that on this matter being mentioned to one of your members, he replied, that he understood that a considerable sum of money had been collected in the town, in aid of the purchase of this chapel; and that it was but right, that if his party paid the expenses, they should also be put in possession of the collection. It is true that a considerable sum was collected, in aid of Church Methodism; and it was stated to most of those who subscribed, that the purchase of the chapel in Osborne-street was one object which was particularly intended. These collections are now in my hands, but I should certainly think that I betrayed the trust imposed on me, were I to part with them for any other purpose than that for which they were subscribed, which was the support of Church Methodism on the plan of Mr. Robinson.—Nearly the whole of the donations were given by Churchmen, and I can bear witness that to nearly the whole of the donors the difference between the two bodies was pointed out, the plan of Mr. Robinson approved; and that it was their expressed wish, that the Society should be totally unconnected with the Irish Conference. How, therefore, with this understanding, could I possibly pay over the money collected to those who now possess the chapel? I have not the least objection to give you the names of the subscribers, and if, on your application to them, they are desirous that the money be paid to you, I will most readily do it. With respect to what was collected at the opening of the chapel, it was also given by many of the same persons, and for the support of Church Methodism, expressly stated not to be under the direction of the Irish Conference. But as it is now impossible to ascertain the wishes of the contributors, I have no objection to pay over the same to you, provided you will undertake to liquidate the debts to which I have alluded.

"I am sorry to have trespassed so long on your time and patience with this matter; but I do feel it to be of considerable importance.—I consider myself to be personally responsible for the payment of the

workmen, as I was one who employed and gave them directions; tho' I am totally unconnected with any party. I have had several very urgent applications from the workmen; and if I am compelled to pay any part of their bills, it will be an entire loss to me, as I cannot, in justice, apply to that purpose sums which were collected for quite a different object. I trust then, Sir, you will give this matter your very serious consideration; and I think, from what I have heard of your character, that I shall not be deceived in what I anticipate will be the result of that consideration.

"An early answer will oblige, Sir,

"Your most obedient Servant,

"Hull, February 1st, 1827.

"W. H. DIKES."

"Beverley, 5th February, 1827.

"SIR,—I was surprised to receive from you, with whom I have no personal acquaintance, a letter which I conceive to be highly improper in relation to both insult and flattery; beside it contains misrepresentations, false premises, and incorrect conclusions. I certainly thought you incapable of writing such a letter, and feel inclined to think so still, if you had not been prompted to it by some one who has less delicacy, and perhaps less conscientious feeling, than yourself.

"I have neither time nor inclination to follow you through your specious but superficial reasonings, some of which is an outrage on our wholesome and impartial laws, in attempting to substitute in opposition to them, your own selfish and partial views of what you call justice and equity. The diversified circumstances and notions of men require a standard of decision, by which their supposed grievances may be settled, and that is the law of the land. I have nothing to do with any transactions, contributions, or collections made by you and your colleagues; nor can I answer for your being unwittingly and "*ignorantly led by false pretences*" and deceit, which ended in disappointment; those evils and imprudencies existed intirely among yourselves, as advocates for what you denominate "Church Methodism," which is now nearly become a non-entity. It appears to me, from what you have stated, that the object of your writing is, by persuasion or flattery, to entice me to take a burden from your shoulders, which neither I nor any other person or persons (but your own party) had or have any thing to do with; and if you had exercised common prudence, you might have avoided both the trouble and expence you complain of, without having recourse to any pitiful stratagem.

"I now beg leave briefly to collect together what appears scattered through two letters, one of them your own—1. The chapel was purchased. 2. Trustees were nominated, and meetings held. 3. Workmen employed, and expences incurred. 4. The chapel opened, and collections made. 5. Subscriptions and donations received.—And 6. The conditions of sale rejected! How absurd, to take any steps before your object was secured. But, however, all this was done without my knowledge, interference, or advice; and now, Sir, that you are called upon to pay the lawful debts you have contracted, you im-

prudently attempt, by shallow reasonings, to operate upon the minds of plain (but I trust honest) men, to induce them to act as foolishly as you and your colleagues have done; therefore be *assured* that you need not trouble me any more on the subject. But rather urge the honour, honesty, justice, and equity with which your letter abounds, upon the minds of the person or persons who led you into the snare.

"I am, Sir, your most obedient Servant,

"R. SMELT."

"P. S.—It may not be improper to observe, that you need have no anxiety in respect to my conduct sullyng the character of a Methodist, as I *never was* a member of any branch of that body."

"To Mr. W. H. Dykes."

"Hull, 6th February, 1827.

"SIR,—I should not have troubled you any further on the subject of my letter to you, were it not for the imputations in yours of the 5th, which I cannot pass unnoticed, and at which I certainly feel much hurt, namely, those of flattery and insult. And previous to noticing those charges, I would just beg leave to correct one mistake under which you labour, namely, that I have been prompted by others in what I have written to you, and that I am incapable of writing such a letter. I beg therefore distinctly to state, that whatever impropriety there may be in that letter, the discredit of it attaches solely to myself; not one word of it was dictated by any one, nor has any person seen it. My sole object in writing to you was, that, thinking, (as I still sincerely do) that the present occupiers of the chapel are in equity bound to pay the expenses incurred in repairing it, I wished to state to them the reasons which led me to that conclusion, under the hope that they might think so too; and I would ask, who can blame me in this? On enquiring who were the owners of the chapel, you were mentioned to me as one; and from the character I had heard of you, (if it was a flattered one, do not lay that to my charge, I did not invent it,) I determined to write to you—not a letter of insult and flattery, but a simple statement of facts, and the best arguments I could form upon them.—This you please to denominate a "pitiful stratagem." Of this, however, I should have taken no notice, had I not been charged with insulting you; and on this I will only observe, that it never was my intention to insult any one, much less a person with whom I have no acquaintance, and who has certainly never injured me. I should have thought that the very object of my letter would have shewn you that I had no such intention; for, however "superficial and shallow" my reasonings may be, you might have given me credit for not being so weak as to attempt to obtain an object from any one by insulting him. If, however, you can point out any part of my letter, which, in the opinion of any impartial person, can bear the construction of an insult, I shall be truly glad to make you any apology in my power.

"I remain, Sir, your most obedient Servant,

"To Mr. R. Smelt."

"W. H. DIKES."

ARTICLE XI.

LETTER FROM WILLIAM CURRY, JUN. ESQ. DUBLIN.

"9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin, Jan. 3rd, 1827.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I have this moment received your favor of the 30th ult., and am really quite at a loss how or in what terms to express my surprise and indignation, that any person in our establishment should have presumed to take such a liberty, *without my knowledge or concurrence*, as to have written the letter, I knew not till this moment to have been sent,—especially to you, my dear Sir, whom I always considered as a friend, and hope still to be allowed to look upon in the same light. For your Christian charity and kindness, in suspending your opinion till you had the opportunity of hearing from *myself*, I feel obliged; and it is only what I would expect from the high sense I have always entertained of your judgment and discretion.

"With respect to the differences on the subject of Methodism, tho' I sincerely regret them, I can assure you they do not diminish my regard and esteem for friends with whom I have been previously acquainted. It cannot be expected that all can see through the same glasses; and as long as the independence of the human mind lasts, there will be a difference of opinion on minor points. On the great fundamentals of the Gospel, there will, I trust, be no difference between sincere Christians.

"I trust, my *entire ignorance* and most unqualified disapprobation of the letter of our clerk, will plead my apology for the annoyance you have felt, and that I shall stand excused for it. I have severely reprimanded him for writing, as he did, without my direction. Relying upon your Christian kindness and forbearance, I am, my dear Sir, with much esteem, *always yours most truly*,

"W. CURRY, Jun."

"P. S.—My family do not know of my writing, or would desire their remembrances."

LETTERS TO THE WRITER, ON CHURCH METHODISM.

"DEAR SIR,—I have run too rapidly, I fear, over the two MSS.* which I received in passing through Beverley on Thursday morning; and as far as my view of the subject extends, I think you have completely the advantage over your opponents. Indeed, the letter strikes me as so good, that if I did not hope it might eventually be given to the world, I should have been tempted to ask your leave to transcribe it—as a calm, judicious, and well written exposé of principles leading to what I cannot help deeming a most desirable restoration of the most temperate and pious of the Methodists, (practically, at least) to the bosom of the Established Church. Yours very truly,

"April 10th, 1826.

"*****"

* This refers to the Letter to Mr. Curry, which was copied into two memorandum books at that time.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I have read your letter to Mr. Curry, of which I entirely approve. There are a few verbal errors, which have probably been made by the person whom you employed to transcribe the letter, I have noted some of them with a pencil. I think the absurdity of calling upon persons to subscribe to 8 vols. of sermons and notes, might have been put more strongly, but perhaps you have held your hand for fear of giving offence.

"What is a subscription to xxxix. Articles, compared to this? or even to the 82 Questions of the Bishop of Peterborough?

"How many of the Conference and Irish Methodists who subscribe these works, have read them all? of those, how many have understood them all? and of those, how many can remember them all at the time of subscription? and last of all, how many can say that they subscribe *ex animo* from a solid and serious conviction of their truth, after full and attentive consideration of their important meaning? Let it not be answered, that we subscribe to the Scriptures without difficulty; that is quite another thing, though a person may not understand and remember, or even have read the whole of the Scriptures, he may conscientiously subscribe to their truth upon the one simple principle, that he believes them to have been given by *the inspiration* of God. But I conceive, no one can with propriety subscribe to the truth of any human composition, until he knows, understands, and is thoroughly convinced of it, upon mature and attentive consideration. I suppose, the next step will be to require every thorough stitch son of Conference Methodism to subscribe to all the resolutions and dogmas of Conference, and all that ever has been, and all that ever hereafter shall be published in the Evangelical or Methodist Magazine? After all, the doors of the Church of England seem to me to be thrown more widely open, than that of any other denomination of Christians. The Socinians may urge their claim to the same merit, but I do not consider them as Christians at all.

Believe me, ever truly, yours,

" * * * * * "

"Dec. 14th, 1825.

"DEAR SIR,—Finding, by my esteemed Mr. Coltman, that you have done me the honor of requesting my opinion respecting the requisition of the Irish Conference, I feel no hesitation in saying that they appear to me arbitrary and unjust in the highest degree. I am not partial to the imposition of subscription to human formularies of any sort, tho' I think a substantial agreement in the fundamental verities of Christianity essential to Christian communion. But to demand an assent to all the positions comprehended in bulky volumes of human compositions, is monstrous. It is a snare to the conscience; a real and enlightened assent to such multifarious propositions, is next to impossible; a verbal or pretended one is all that can be expected, and thus a door is opened to the jesuitical distinction between articles of faith, and articles of peace. In other words, a system of prevarication and collusion. When will professing Christians cease from making religion a rallying point of party, and a symbol of strife? Why cannot

honest men understand and confide in each other, without attempting to fetter the mind and entangle the conscience by unauthorized imposition and subscriptions? I flatter myself, Mr. Wesley himself would have been among the first to deprecate such a use of his writings. Were I in your situation, I would withstand to the uttermost such an invasion of Christian liberty.

"Give me leave to embrace this opportunity of acknowledging the pleasure I derived from your strictures on the conduct of Conference.* You appear to me to have a decided superiority in the argument,—they may resist the claims of justice, and the voice of the people for a time, but they must yield at last.

"I remain, dear Sir, with much esteem,

"Yours respectfully,

" * * * * *

* This refers to the '*Observations on the System of Wesleyan Methodism.*'

ARTICLE XII.

Extract from the Memoirs of the late Mr John Robinson, of Lockington Car, drawn up by the writer, and published in the Methodist Magazine for 1821.



“The following is an extract from the Memoir of the writer’s late father, which he sent to the *Methodist Magazine* for Feb. 1821, and which is referred to here, in proof of the assertion (at p. 44) that his sentiments were in unison with those of the writer.

“The late Mr. Robinson was born in this town (Lockington) on the 25th of January, 1753. During the first 40 years of his life, though his conduct was outwardly moral, he remained a stranger to that experimental piety which constituted the great source of his happiness in after life, and proved his consolation in the hour of death. The loss of one of his children, who died about five years of age, was, by the blessing of God, made the occasion of the first serious impressions on his own mind, and on that of his partner in life; but of her it is not now our business to speak: suffice it to say, she became a humble follower of Christ, and from her pious life, there is every reason to believe, they are now re-united in those happy regions

“Where death shall all be done away,
And friends shall part no more.”

“He believed himself called upon to unite with a people whose ministry he had found so eminently useful to his own mind; he accordingly joined the Methodist Society in this place, which he viewed as a company of serious individuals meeting together for their mutual edification, while they remained, as before, members of the Established Church: and these were his uniform views through life. He regularly received the sacrament of the Lord’s supper at the hands of the regular Clergy, even when he removed to Beverley, which was about twelve months ago, and where the Clergy were personally strangers to him, and where consequently none of those ties could bind him, which might have had, and perhaps had, their force in a parish where he had long personally known the minister, whose upright character, whenever there was occasion, he always made it his business to defend.”

December 13th, 1819.

ARTICLE XIII.

MESSRS. GRAHAM & HIRST'S LETTER, RESPECTING MR. WELCH.

To the Editor of the Hull Advertiser.

"SIR,—In perusing your useful paper of the 25th inst., we were much surprised to see a boastful and scurrilous article, addressed to you, by Mr. C. Welch, in which he endeavours to throw an odium on the character of Mr. M. Robinson, by flatly denying that he ever argued or acted against the present System of Wesleyan Methodism, as stated by Mr. R. in an article inserted in your paper of the preceding week. Now, Sir, it will appear from the following facts, what degree of credit can be attached to Mr. W.'s most solemn assertion. First—A popular preacher in this circuit, when applied to for Mr. W.'s admission as a member of the Wesleyan Connexion, objected, on the ground of his being then opposed to their System. Secondly—His having been in Connexion with the Independent Methodists—a body decidedly opposed to the System of Conference or Wesleyan Methodists; and having frequently walked from Hull to Driffield, a distance of 22 miles, to preach for them. This fact, Sir, is of itself, sufficient confirmation of Mr. R.'s assertion, according to Mr. W.'s mode of reasoning—that Mr. R. having been connected with the Wesleyan Methodists, and having sustained an office in their Society, had supported the System he now opposes:—"Out of thine own mouth shalt thou be judged." Thirdly—We have, in many conversations with Mr. W. heard him decidedly reprobate the System in question; and also animadvert in strong terms on the Conference, charging their proceedings with "ambiguity," and giving it as his opinion, that no human power could force them to act openly and fairly. We have selected thus much, to shew that Mr. R.'s statement was perfectly correct; and we presume that he (Mr. R.) does not assign, as a reason for his declining a formal answer to Mr. W.'s Pamphlet, his having changed his opinions merely, but his having denied the fact in his Introduction to his Investigation of Mr. R.'s Letter, &c. as nothing honourable could be expected from a man who could thus deviate from the common path of rectitude. We also presume, Sir, that Mr. W. had no room left for boasting as he has done; as Mr. R. had promised, in your preceding paper, to reply to any arguments his Pamphlet contains, when he publishes his answer to Mr. Sandwith's 'Apology,' which, we believe, he will shortly do. Mr. W. may then possibly find that, instead of boasting of his nineteen propositions, he would have done well to have remembered that advice—"Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast himself as he that putteth it off." Let Mr. W. reply to this, and if he deny it, we shall beg to be indulged with another portion of your paper.

"In the mean time, we remain, Sir,

"Your obedient Servants,

"38, High-street, & Waterhouse-lane,
March 27th, 1825."

"WM. GRAHAM.

"M. HIRST."

1000

1. The first part of the paper is devoted to a general discussion of the problem of the origin of life. It is shown that the problem is one of the most important and most difficult in the history of science. The author discusses the various theories of the origin of life, and shows that the most plausible is the theory of spontaneous generation. This theory is based on the fact that life is a complex of many different parts, and that these parts are all derived from a common ancestor. The author shows that the theory of spontaneous generation is supported by the facts of the origin of life, and that it is the only theory that can explain the origin of life.

2. The second part of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the problem of the origin of the human race. It is shown that the problem is one of the most important and most difficult in the history of science. The author discusses the various theories of the origin of the human race, and shows that the most plausible is the theory of spontaneous generation. This theory is based on the fact that the human race is a complex of many different parts, and that these parts are all derived from a common ancestor. The author shows that the theory of spontaneous generation is supported by the facts of the origin of the human race, and that it is the only theory that can explain the origin of the human race.

3. The third part of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the problem of the origin of the human mind. It is shown that the problem is one of the most important and most difficult in the history of science. The author discusses the various theories of the origin of the human mind, and shows that the most plausible is the theory of spontaneous generation. This theory is based on the fact that the human mind is a complex of many different parts, and that these parts are all derived from a common ancestor. The author shows that the theory of spontaneous generation is supported by the facts of the origin of the human mind, and that it is the only theory that can explain the origin of the human mind.

INDEX.

A.

Agreement between the trustees and Mr. M'Afee, &c. on his first coming to Beverley	2
— between the Dublin conference and Messrs. Robinson & Atkinson, as representatives of the church methodists of England, that the <i>preachers</i> , not the <i>people</i> , be under the control of the Irish conference—broken by Messrs. M'Afee & M'Conkey ..	4
— between Mr. West and the trustees of the Beverley church methodist chapel, broken by the former	102
Averill, Rev. Adam, approved of the two kinds of class-meeting held by the church methodists	5
Address from the dissenting conference to their societies, in 1792, informing them that the Almighty had determined against the methodist preachers administering the sacraments	73

B.

Band-meetings, remarks on Mr. Richard Watson's defence of, established by the dissenting or conference methodists, and the primitive methodists of Ireland, shewn to approach toward popery	86
Bogue and Bennett, opposed to band-meetings	91
Benson, Joseph, his observations on the settlement of methodist chapels ..	pref. iv.
Book-room, state of ought to be made known, in the opinion of T. Thompson, Esq. of Hull	75

C.

Class-meetings, called by Mr. Wesley "little <i>prudential</i> helps, not <i>essential</i> , not of <i>divine</i> institution," 10.—Two kinds of, in the church methodist society, constant attendance on either of which constitute a member of society, sanctioned by the Rev. Mr. Averill	5
Clarke, Dr. Adam, as president of the methodist conference, calls on the young preachers to profess their belief in doctrines which he was professedly endeavouring to overthrow	9
Committee of the primitive Wesleyan methodist society in Dublin, in their official letter avow the very principle which Messrs. M'Afee & M'Conkey opposed so strenuously in Beverley .. (note)	21
Chrysostom, and the Ancient Fathers, opposed to the principle of band-meeting ..	25
Chase, Philander, Bishop of Ohio, his eulogium on church methodism ..	50
Conference—The dissenting conference consists of travelling preachers only; in church methodist connexion, to consist of travelling preachers on the one hand, and representatives from the societies on the other; but to have <i>separate</i> , not <i>conjunct</i> powers— <i>pref. i.</i> and	8
Corry, Mrs. John, Dublin	3
Curry, William, Esq. letter from	109

INDEX.

D.

Delegates to conference, approved by Mr. Richard Watson, when he was a preacher in the new connexion. — (*see Watson*)—and by Thos. Thompson, Esq. of Hull, Mr. Thomas Galland, Mr. H. Sandwith, and many travelling preachers, as well as by a majority of the last methodist conference held in Philadelphia.—(*See respective articles.*)

F.

Fletcher, Rev. John, his views of calvinism and arminianism 21
 _____, fine passage from 29

G.

Galland, Mr. Thomas, does not, in the opinion of the Christian Remembrancer, deny the extravagant power assumed by the methodist preachers, 64.—Hears it determined in conference, that a superintendent preacher can dismiss any member from the society he pleases, and that in opposition to the determination of a leader's or quarterly meeting.—He himself was ready to exercise the same authority at Lincoln, 65.—Contends for the necessity of meeting in class, as conducted amongst the methodists, the neglect of which would place the salvation of the individual in jeopardy, 66.
 .. Makes a gross misrepresentation respecting the author's class, 67.—Considers the evangelical clergy the greatest enemies the methodists have, *ibid.*—The letter to the Editor of the Rockingham newspaper, 66.—Is requested by Messrs. Cookman, Harrison, Atkinson, Taylor, Henwood, Shepherd and Brigham, to summon the proper persons to hold a meeting to re-hear the author's case, as determined upon at the Hull meeting, 46. Said by Mr. Waller, of Wisbeach, to have carried on the work of persecution against the author which was begun by Mr. Johnson 47
 Graham & Hirst's letter, respecting Mr. Welch 113

H.

Homilies of the Church of England, condemn the principle acted upon in band meetings, quoted by Mr. Richard Watson on the subject, but not the true sense given.. .. . 87
 Henwood, James, acute remark of 48
 Hooker, opposed to the principle of band-meeting 25
 Hey, Mr. (Surgeon, of Leeds) attempts a re-union of the methodists with the church, in his day 18

I.

Isaac, Mr. Daniel, methodist preacher, writes a book against the church of England, the arguments of which many of the preachers oppose; the conference disapproves of its *spirit*, and from motives of policy condemn the *book*, but hold the author innocent 76
 Impressions of a religious nature, which do not come through the medium of the understanding, justly questionable.. .. . 88

J.

Johnson, Mr. Robert, methodist preacher, his arbitrary proceedings noticed by Mr. Waller 47

INDEX.

K.

Kearney, Rev. Mr. of Kilgoblin, in favour of English church methodism ..	3
Keene, Mr. jun. Dublin	5

L.

Lot, by which the methodist preachers, in 1792, professed to know that the Almighty had forbidden them to administer the sacraments to their societies	73
Litchfield meeting, when certain methodist preachers met to agree upon some plan of episcopal ordination	75
Luther, Martin, his liberality in uniting with the Moravians	13
Ladies, (two sisters) are first extremely suspicious of Mr. West, but afterwards greatly attached to him, and zealously further his views,	96 and 98

M.

M'Afee and Mallin, state to the trustees that having no meetings in canonical hours, having a representative system, and giving no sacraments, are the only points of agreement required by the Irish of the church methodists here, in order to their assisting them ..	2
———, (Mr.) meets the trustees with a list of questions, which the trustees answer ..	3
——— acknowledgement of having received £83. 16s. and promise, conditionally, to return part of it to the trustees, 38.—Condemns Mr. M'Conkey for not keeping to his agreement	39
M'Conkey, (Mr.) agrees with the trustees to return to Ireland, and receives money of them to pay his expenses, but after taking it refuses either to go or return it, 37.—The ground on which Mr. Smelt is said to justify his conduct, 38.—He takes forcible possession of Mr. Hillaby's house, and has provision sent him from Mr. Smelt	102
Methodists, (New) praised by Mr. Richard Watson, the present president of the dissenting methodist conference, and by Mr. Oakes, a travelling preacher in the same connexion, for their having introduced lay representatives into their conference—(See Watson)	82
Missions, (Methodist) objections to the appropriation of some of their monies in Ireland	83
Methodist, description of, by Mr. Wesley	15
Melanchthon, Philip, liberal sentiments of	13
Moravians, unite with the Lutherans, on the broad ground of an agreement on essential principles	12

O.

Oakes, Mr. (a methodist preacher) joins Mr. Richard Watson, the present president of the conference, in extolling the excellence of the representative system adopted by the new methodists, which they regard as being of great importance	82
---	----

P.

Preachers' private fund.	75
----------------------------------	----

R.

Robinson, Mr. Bell, offers Mr. Tinkler, of Hull, a thousand guineas, on behalf of the Irish methodists, to rescind his bargain with the church methodists, for the Osborne-street chapel	35
———, (late Mr. John, of Lockington Car) memoirs of	112

S.

- Sandwith, Mr. H. a short time before he published his pamphlet, an advocate for representation in conference; his pamphlet more temperate and judicious than Mr. Welch's or Mr. Galland's, 52.—Between him and the author a long and tender friendship subsisted, 52.—His fairness and candour in acknowledging that he did not intend to impeach his moral character at all, in what he had written—friendly feeling of the author towards 53
- Smelt, Mr. Robert, signs a letter addressed to the primitive Wesleyan methodists of Ireland, professing his approval of the sentiments expressed in the official letter of the Dublin committee, though directly opposed by Messrs. M'Afee and M'Conkey, 22.—Afterwards becomes so much attached to Mr. M'Conkey, as to prefer his remaining here instead of Mr. M'Afee, 41.—His correspondence with Mr. W. H. Dikes, 104.—Loud in his praise of the author and his friends, for having withstood Mr. Galland, 48.—Signs a resolution that the conversation between Mr. Galland and the class be published 68
- Stewart, Mr. William, considers the methodist preachers, not the people, as the cause of introducing the sacraments into the connexion .. 79
- Sermón, (Mr. Wesley's) on the Vineyard considered, in reply to Mr. Watson 92
- Southey, Robert, Esq. his character of Robinson's 'Observations on the System of Wesleyan methodism' (note) 43
- his opinion of the utility of church methodism 50

T.

- Thompson, Thomas, Esq. (Hull) is chairman of a meeting at Leeds, where it is agreed to send representatives to conference, yet is very angry with the author for endeavouring to effect the same thing, 44.—Is appointed by conference one of the trustees for keeping methodism in union with the established church—now violently opposes the author and his friends for endeavouring to do the same 49
- Trustees of the Beverley chapel, protest against the decision of the meeting held in Waltham-street chapel, Hull; and request Mr. Galland to summon the proper persons to try the question 46

W.

- Watson, Mr. Richard, (present president of the methodist conference) charges the system of methodism, in 1805, with being arbitrary, and encouraging an illegal and unchristian exercise of power in the travelling preachers over the people, *pref.* p. 3.—Compliments the new methodists (or followers of the late Mr. Alexander Kilham) for having adopted so excellent a constitution as that which provides that the conference shall be composed of *travelling preachers* on the one part, and *representatives from the societies* on the other, 82.—This he thought calculated to promote that union and reciprocal confidence which are so essential to the interest and character of christianity—professed that it was *matter of conscience* with them to unite on such a plan.—Considered the plan of sending delegates to conference, a liberal plan—characterised by a beautiful simplicity—FOUNDED ON SCRIPTURE—FOUNDED ON THE MAXIMS OF OUR SAVIOUR.—Hopes that the new methodists are sensible of the *great importance* of it, 83.—Professed how deeply he and his friends would be affected to see the new methodists grow insensible to the good of the connexion—that to shrink from being zealous in the cause, would be a reproach to them, *ibid.*—His remarks on band-meetings considered, 86.—His reply to Dr. Southey, respecting one of Mr. Wesley's sermons, shewn to be very unsatisfactory—and his charging Dr. Southey with dishonesty shewn not only to be very uncourteous, but unjust 92

INDEX.

Welch, Mr. Charles, walks many miles to preach for the independent methodists at Driffeld, states that he has always approved of the system of methodism, contradicted by Messrs. Graham & Hirst, who say they have heard him assert the contrary, 113.—His pamphlet thought meanly of by the Christian Guardian, and considered by the Christian Remembrancer as being singularly unhappy in proving the very reverse of that which he sets out to prove, 61.—Allows that the system of methodism goes to prostrate the people at the feet of the preachers, 62.—Is contradicted by the methodist magazine itself, as to the main fact on which he relies,	63
Whitehead, Dr. on the original intention of methodism, 78.—His character of some of the methodist preachers	84
Waldenses, united with Calvin's church, in Geneva	13
Waller's (Mr. of Wisbeach) animadversions on Sandwith's 'Apology for the System of Wesleyan Methodism,'	54
..... on the methodist reviewer	71
West, Mr. G. M. accidentally hearing of his return from America, 33.—Comes to Beverley uninvited, and his object in coming, <i>ibid.</i> —The agreement into which he entered respecting the settling of any difference which might arise between himself and the trustees of the Church Methodist chapel, Beverley, 102.—The trustees dissatisfied with his conduct in several particulars; by a regular notice express their wish to dismiss him from their connexion, 103.—Refusing to have his conduct investigated, is legally dismissed, <i>ibid.</i> —Litigation in reference to the Hull chapel, 96.—Vacillation respecting the purchase of the chapel and premises in Beverley, 35.—The party in Cork does not appear against him at the Irish conference, yet because of his conduct in America, they refuse to admit him into connexion; nevertheless, in returning to Beverley, is joined by Messrs. Ford & McConkey in taking forcible possession of Mr. Hillaby's house, 101.—His amazing influence over the minds of two elderly ladies, who become anxious that he should have the sole management of church methodism	98

ERRATA.

- Page 4, line 14 of the note—*original*, read *originat*.
Page 9, line 35—*dry*, read *raw*.
Page 36, line 42—article xi. read article x.
Page 42, line 12 (note)—of primitive, read of *the* primitive.
Page 45, line 44—*Ponkin*, read *Parkin*.
Page 50, line 38—*John Froste*, read *John Foster*.
Page 76, line 4—*womewhat*, read *somewhat*.
Page 83, line 27—*jeatous*, read *zealous*.
Page 105, line 44—*as* possessor, read *as a* possessor.

Note.—The letter referred to on page 33, contained only the following postscript respecting Mr. West:—"We were all much surprised last evening, by the sudden and unexpected appearance in the French church, of Mr. G. M. West, from America. He came into the pulpit to me, and said great things; but how the matter will terminate, I cannot tell.

"S. H."

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: May 2006

PreservationTechnologies

A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION

111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

Bx 9.332

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 017 658 249 2